

NOV 6 '35

# The South Atlantic Quarterly

Editorial Board: William H. Wannamaker, William T. Laprade,  
Newman I. White, and Calvin B. Hoover

Managing Editor: Henry R. Dwire

Volume XXXIV

NEW YORK  
PUBLIC  
LIBRARY

Durham, North Carolina  
Duke University Press  
1935

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY  
**830133 A**  
ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS  
R 1996 L

NOV 14 1996  
1996  
1996

## Contents of Volume XXXIV

---

### Number 1, January, 1935

The Philanthropic Endowment in Modern Life	
<i>Robert M. Lester</i> .....	1
Foreign Markets and the Economic Position of the United States .....	<i>J. Fred Rippy</i> .....
	15
The Southern Lady's Library, 1700-1776	
<i>Julia Cherry Spruill</i> .....	23
Metaphysic and Pirandello .....	<i>E. C. Knowlton</i> .....
	42
Some Early Discussions of the College Curriculum	
<i>Edgar W. Knight</i> .....	60
The House of Representatives and the President	
<i>Floyd M. Riddick</i> .....	79
A Merchant-Planter of the Old South. <i>Josiah Moffatt</i> .....	91
Comments on Books .....	105

### Number 2, April, 1935

The Monroe Doctrine from Roosevelt to Roosevelt	
<i>David Y. Thomas</i> .....	117
The Utopian Novel in America, 1888-1900	
<i>Robert L. Shurter</i> .....	137
The Good Samaritan of St. Helena Island	
<i>Mason Crum</i> .....	145
Napoleon II .....	<i>George Matthew Dutcher</i> ...
	154
Malthusianism and the Debate on Slavery	
<i>J. J. Spengler</i> .....	179
Public Benefits and Private Profits ... <i>Walter J. Matherly</i> .....	191
Wild Heart: An Appreciation of Emily Jane Brontë	
<i>Ralph Aiken</i> .....	202
Robert E. Lee .....	<i>William K. Boyd</i> .....
	211
Comments on Books .....	220

Number 3, July, 1935

Leftward Ho!.....	<i>Roger Shaw</i> .....	237
Education and Social Change.....	<i>Newton Edwards</i> .....	244
Early Labor Organization in North Carolina, 1880-1900	<i>H. M. Douty</i> .....	260
Ecclesiastic Anvils of Peace.....	<i>Harold P. Marley</i> .....	269
The Public Utility Holding Company in Theory and Practice.....	<i>Norman S. Buchanan</i> .....	282
French and English Mutual Analyses. <i>Geraldine P. Dilla</i> .....		293
The Temperance Movement in North Carolina	<i>D. J. Whitener</i> .....	305
Some Recent Changes in the College Curriculum	<i>Edgar W. Knight</i> .....	314
Comments on Books.....		333

Number 4, October, 1935

Whither the Sovereign State?.....	<i>F. R. Aumann</i> .....	345
Mark Twain's Despair: An Explanation in Terms of His Humanity.....	<i>Richard D. Altick</i> .....	359
Abraham Lincoln Fights the Battle of Fort Sumter	<i>Archibald Rutledge</i> .....	368
The Endocrine System.....	<i>Bert Cunningham</i> .....	384
American Radicals Nobody Knows... <i>Broadus Mitchell</i> .....		394
The Modernity of the Ancients.....	<i>Louis Pendleton</i> .....	402
Melville Against the World.....	<i>Stephen A. Larrabee</i> .....	410
Recent British Politics and the Newspaper Barons, 1929-1935.....	<i>W. T. Morgan</i> .....	419
Comments on Books.....		444



774155 1

18202

# *The* SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY

34  
1935

• • •

JANUARY, 1935

The Philanthropic Endowment in Modern Life  
Robert M. Lester

Foreign Markets and the Economic Position  
of the United States  
J. Fred Rippy

The Southern Lady's Library, 1700-1776  
Julia Cherry Spruill

Metaphysic and Pirandello  
E. C. Knowlton

Some Early Discussions of the College Curriculum  
Edgar W. Knight

The House of Representatives and the President  
Floyd M. Riddick

A Merchant-Planter of the Old South  
Josiah Moffatt

Book Reviews

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY FOR  
THE SOUTH ATLANTIC PUBLISHING COMPANY  
BY THE DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
DURHAM, N. C., U. S. A.

# The South Atlantic Quarterly

FOUNDED IN 1902 BY THE 9019 SCHOLARSHIP SOCIETY OF TRINITY COLLEGE

## OFFICERS

Robert L. Flowers, Pres.

Albert M. Wehh, Vice-Pres.

D. W. Newsom, Sec.-Treas.

## DIRECTORS

W. P. Few, Wm. H. Glasson, R. L. Flowers, Wm. H. Wannamaker, D. W. Newsom, W. K. Bayd

Editorial Board: William H. Wannamaker William T. Laprade

Newman I. White and Calvin B. Hoover

Managing Editor: Henry R. Dwire

Communications in regard to articles, book reviews and editorial matters should be addressed to Managing Editor, SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY, Duke University, Durham, N. C. While reasonable diligence is observed, the return of unsolicited manuscripts is not guaranteed. Subscriptions and all communications relating to advertisements and business matters should be addressed to Duke University Press, Durham, N. C. The Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4: agents in Great Britain and Ireland. Subscription rates on application.

## IN THIS ISSUE

	PAGE
THE PHILANTHROPIC ENDOWMENT IN MODERN LIFE.....	Robert M. Lester 1
FOREIGN MARKETS AND THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES.....	J. Fred Rippey 15
THE SOUTHERN LADY'S LIBRARY, 1700-1776.....	Julia Cherry Spruill 23
METAPHYSIC AND PIRANDELLO.....	E. C. Knowlton 42
SOME EARLY DISCUSSIONS OF THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM.....	Edgar W. Knight 60
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT.....	Floyd M. Riddick 79
A MERCHANT-PLANTER OF THE OLD SOUTH.....	Josiah Moffatt 91
COMMENTS ON BOOKS:	
Religious Philosophy of Early America.....	Clarence Gohdes 105
Biography of Heroic Figure.....	R. H. Woody 106
Seventh Volume of Series.....	R. H. Woody 107
The Anniversary of Charles Lamb.....	Newman I. White 108
Steele.....	W. T. Laprade 111
The Life of a Queen.....	W. T. Laprade 112
Historical Research.....	W. T. Laprade 112
East and West.....	James Cannon, III 113
Two New Mission Books.....	James Cannon, III 113
The Twelve Living Religions.....	James Cannon, III 114
Nationalism in Lombardy.....	E. Malcolm Carroll 114

Contents of previous issues of South Atlantic Quarterly can be found by consulting the INTERNATIONAL INDEX in your library.

Issued in the Months of January, April, July, and October.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Postoffice at Durham, N. C.

Copyright, 1935, by Duke University Press

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

ROBERT M. LESTER, a native Alabamian and Methodist preacher's son, studied at Birmingham-Southern, Vanderbilt, Michigan, and Columbia; taught and superintended schools in Tennessee and Kentucky; was a member at various times of the library, the teaching, and the administrative staff at Columbia University; became Assistant to the President of Carnegie Corporation in 1926, and for eight years watched the race of educators (plain, fancy and assorted, he says) go by; in 1934 he was elected Secretary (the second person to hold that office) of the Corporation, and now devotes his time to keeping the official, complicated, and interesting record of the greatest single philanthropic trust ever created.

J. FRED RIPPY, Professor of History, Duke University, author of several works on Hispanic American History and the Foreign Relations of the United States.

JULIA CHERRY SPRUILL, native North Carolinian and wife of C. P. Spruill, Jr., Professor of Economics at the University of North Carolina, took her A.B. from North Carolina College for Women, her A.M. from the University of North Carolina, and has been for six years a member of the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina. This article is from her book, *Southern Women in the Colonies*, now in preparation.

EDGAR C. KNOWLTON received the three usual degrees at Harvard; military service overseas; study and travel in Europe. Teaching: Lafayette, University of Illinois. Ohio Wesleyan; summers, Stanford, University of Texas, Washington. Author of *Outline of World Literature*; freshman texts; articles on Stevenson, Dostoevski, Elizabethan drama, nature in literature, pastoral in English and German, education.

EDGAR W. KNIGHT, well-known North Carolina educator and writer. Educated at Trinity College (now Duke University) and at Columbia (Ph.D., 1913), he has served as Professor of Education at Trinity, Superintendent of Wake County (N. C.) schools, and Professor of Education in the University of North Carolina. Author of: *The Influence of Reconstruction on Education in the South*, *Some Principles of Teaching*, *Reconstruction and Education in South Carolina*, *Public School Education in North Carolina*, *Public Education in the South*, *Among the Danes*, *Reports on European Education*, *Education in the United States*, *Education in China (with others) 1933* and *Education in Iraq (with others) 1933*. He is a frequent contributor to magazines on educational and social subjects.

FLOYD M. RIDDICK completed undergraduate work at Duke University; M.A. degree at Vanderbilt University; and is now a candidate for Ph.D. at Duke University. He spent most of the year 1934 in Washington, D. C., observing procedure in the House of Representatives and working with the Government.

JOSIAH MOFFATT is a native of South Carolina. Withdrew from ministry for doctrinal reasons; taught school; wrote, and lectured on biblical and other topics. Author of essay, "The Scotch-Irish of the Up-Country" (*This Quarterly*, April, '34), "The Old Plantation" (*Pastoral Poetry Of To-day*, London) and other articles and poems. In Federal Customs Service, Tampa, Florida.



## IF THE *Telephone* WERE NOT THERE!

MANY times each day you reach for the telephone on your desk at the office or in its familiar spot at home. It is an old and trusted friend. You scarcely give a thought to what it means to a busy day.

Yet suppose the telephone were not there! Suppose—for a week—or a month—you could not call anybody by telephone and nobody could call you! The whole

machinery of business and the home would be thrown out of gear. Orders would be lost—efficiency and profits reduced. You would be out of touch with the world about you.

America needs quick, reliable telephone service to get things done in the brisk, crisp American manner. And it enjoys the best service in the world.

Greater progress has been made in this country because of the Bell System's one policy, one system and universal service.



America leads in telephone service. In relation to population, there are six times as many telephones in this country as in Europe and the telephone is used nine times as much.

**BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

# The South Atlantic Quarterly

Vol. XXXIV

JANUARY, 1935

Number 1

## THE PHILANTHROPIC ENDOWMENT IN MODERN LIFE\*

ROBERT M. LESTER

THE kind introduction which has just been accorded me by the distinguished representative of your State University may have led some of you to suspect that the present speaker is a research specialist, an educational expert, or a social philosopher. Permit me here and now to state that I am none of these. It is true, however, that in common with others who work for foundations, it has been my lot and my living for nearly a decade to sit as it were at the side of one of the main travelled roads, Fifth Avenue, New York, and watch the race of men go by. There, during this period, I have had ample opportunity to observe certain movements and tendencies, to hear the confused shouts and murmurs of those who run to and fro on the highway, and to learn much from those wayfarers who have found time to rest with me by the wayside and to recount their experiences, relate their dreams, and reveal what they consider the proper destinations for themselves and for their fellow men. These wayfarers have been scientists, scholars, directors, librarians, social workers, reformers, university and college presidents—all of whom were in search of funds to support activities (plain and fancy) in the United States, and points North, South, East, and West. These advocates of causes have served to some extent as my educators; at least through them I have

\* This address was delivered by Dr. Lester, who is Secretary of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, at the public meeting in Raleigh, N. C., on December 11, 1934, in observance of the Tenth Anniversary of the Duke Endowment.

become acquainted with some of the needs of a modern and changing world, and with some of the challenging opportunities for philanthropic endeavor.

First of all, on this occasion, it is my pleasant duty to bring to the trustees of The Duke Endowment the greetings of Carnegie Corporation of New York, with congratulations on what has already been accomplished, and with hopes of a successful solution of those perplexing and practical problems which continually face those who try to administer the terms of a great public trust.

The programs and events of this day have given many of us a new conception of the activities of The Duke Endowment, and now it is an event worthy of note that this great audience has come together tonight in this modern city of Raleigh—itsself an expression of the new scientific and materialistic age—to commemorate the altruistic impulses of a native Carolinian.

By holidays, we often commemorate great deeds of war, conquest, and discovery; through religious sanction on other holidays, we commemorate certain events more or less dimly apprehended; but rarely do we find time to lay aside our daily tasks to celebrate the memory of one who has wrought his great deeds in a peaceful walk of life, or distinguished himself by love of his fellow man. Fortunately, it is not required of me here tonight to pronounce an eulogy upon the memory of Mr. Duke. That has been done by those who knew him; and the facts of his personal and public life have been, for the past seven years, a matter of public record. Nor is it incumbent upon me to review the work of the unique trust which he created. The account of that stewardship has already been given by the preceding speaker, Mr. Norman Cocke.

As my part in these proceedings, I have been asked to discuss the general subject of the place of the philanthropic endowment in modern life, and this I shall attempt to do by talking to you about foundations—foundations in general,



what they are, how they are operated, and how they try to justify their existence as social agencies.

The foundation idea is, of course, not new. It can be traced back to the Greeks and Romans, if you wish, and even farther as you read more and more into the past. The Roman Catholic Church early became a foundation, rather a series of foundations, and in Europe and England there exist today foundations of great antiquity, chiefly for charity and education, and some with purposes far outdated. With the course of years, hundreds of others have disappeared through misfortune or mismanagement. The foundation as a method of disposing of surplus wealth has long been questioned by some economists, who regard it partly as an effort on the part of an individual to impose his will on society long after his own death, and partly as an unnatural and impractical way of benefitting mankind. But the attitude of thoughtful people today is more liberal.

The early days of our country, characterized by a restless population and expanding frontiers, brought little surplus wealth, and it was not until our own day and time that there developed the American foundation, distinctly a phenomenon of the Twentieth Century, and of a scope and size hitherto unknown. The exploitation of a vast new continent during the Nineteenth Century produced a series of fortunes of unprecedented size. The possessors of these princely fortunes, filled with a desire for public service, turned to colleges, universities, charitable and research institutions as a means of ridding themselves of surplus wealth and at the same time of bettering the lot of mankind. The creation of these trusts received little public attention, because as a rule the name of the donor had become well known through his personal gifts before he saw fit to set up a public trust. During the past thirty years, scores of foundations have been set up, and their successful and beneficent operations thus far have given witness of their usefulness. Whether or not they disprove Turgot's criticism that they must ultimately fail because of the loss of the original zeal and enthusiasm imparted by their

founder, remains to be seen. But it must be borne in mind that the purposes of the great American trusts are, in the last analysis, subject to the will of their trustees, and are essentially variable, not fixed. Primarily, the founder of a philanthropic endowment commits an act of simple faith: he believes that his friends and their successors, as trustees, will, by some uncanny process, which he trusts them to discover, succeed in applying his money so intelligently and systematically that the world will be a better place in which to live.

The prescription for a foundation, then, is simple: first, make your money; second, determine your philosophy; third, combine the money and the philosophy. The success of this prescription generation after generation depends upon the quality of the trustees and their devotion to the ideals of the founder and the needs of society.

The most amazing thing about foundations is that so few people—even informed and intelligent people—know about them.

Mr. Evans Clark, of the Twentieth Century Fund, in recent years has made a careful compilation of the more tangible trusts or foundations. His summary includes the essential information concerning 129 foundations in the United States, whose total capital is some \$800,000,000. These 129 foundations may be divided roughly into two kinds: (1) charitable, (2) educational. The charitable trusts are important as an evidence of the spirit of human brotherhood, but they are of less ultimate significance to society than the foundations whose purpose is constructive rather than palliative, and which have in mind chiefly educational, scientific, and social progress. Some foundations are for a specific purpose, such as to provide the services of a brass band upon the anniversary of the donor's death, or for maintenance of hitching racks at the four corners of the courthouse square in Marion, Indiana. Some are for very general purposes, such as "the well being of mankind throughout the world," or the "advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding." Out of 29 trusts listed by Mr. Clark, seven of the general ones together con-



trol over \$500,000,000 and, from their income alone, have given away \$280,000,000 in the past ten years. With such sums devoted to the progress of the human race, it is well worth the time to learn something about the way in which large foundations are set up, and something of how they operate.

There are three general bases upon which foundations are established, and these are determined as a rule by the donor. Each involves the element of time.

(a) There are unlimited trusts, such as the Rockefeller ones, of which both income and capital are subject at all times to the discretion of the trustees.

(b) There are restricted trusts, such as the Rosenwald Fund, of which all income and capital must be distributed by the trustee within a fixed period of years.

(c) There are perpetual trusts, such as the Duke Endowment and the six Carnegie ones in this country, of which the capital must be handed down intact from year to year, the income only being subject to disbursement by the trustees.

These three divisions are applicable only to the duration of the trust. When one considers the purposes of foundations, and the means of attaining those purposes, there is great diversity. The Duke Endowment is unique, as was ably described by Mr. William R. Perkins several years ago in an address at Lynchburg, Virginia. It is the only great foundation to which the donor seems to have contributed in major part the control and operation of a business, in addition to the specified objects of religion, hospitalization, and education.

Underlying each kind of trust is a different social attitude. The giver of an unlimited trust, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, admits simply that he has found no opportunity so challenging as to demand the application of this money during the period in which he controlled it. He, therefore, turns the responsibility over to a selected group of trustees who exercise their discretion both as to income and capital. The giver of a restricted trust, such as the Rosenwald Fund, believes that the surplus of one generation should not be carried over into the second generation following the giver. The giver of

a perpetual trust, such as The Duke Endowment, believes that it is proper for one generation out of its good fortune to build up a reservoir from which oncoming generations may draw perpetually—or as long as the financial structure upon which it is based continues to stand.

The actual administration of a foundation is not so simple. There is a Board of Trustees, legally entrusted with the money and operating under a state or federal charter. They hold meetings, maybe one, maybe a dozen a year, at which the expenditure of money is actually authorized. They also pay much attention to the investment of capital, for income and capital must be produced and conserved if funds for distribution are to be continuously available. A board must be so constituted in varied talents and interests of its members, that wisdom and skill can be devoted both to making money and to giving money away. Contrary to general belief, few boards, even of educational foundations, are composed of college and university presidents. Financiers, lawyers, doctors, directors of large commercial and industrial interests are chiefly the groups from which trustees come. Through such boards of informed and intelligent laymen, acting for the layman who established the trust, there is applied the knowledge and experience of the world of affairs to the theory and idealism of educators, scientists, librarians, social workers, and others who seek funds, and through this fusion efforts are made for the advancement of society.

These trustees are not supposed to be honorary appointees, because the responsibility for administering a large sum of money is a heavy one. To find men of sound judgment, wide experience, of active imagination and of discrimination who will give time and effort to the duties of trusteeship is not easy. Trustees of a public trust are in fact stewards of wealth left by one man to benefit the public and as such are accountable to the regularly constituted society under whose protection and approval, by charter, they are enabled to carry out the philanthropic designs of the founder. The almost universal experience of boards of trustees is that a foundation

gives its best and most satisfactory service when it chooses wisely a leader who devotes his thought and life to the problems of the trust, and when it gives him the inspiration of their association and the restraints of their objective judgment upon the opportunities and proposals which arise.

Certainly it is of more than historical interest to call attention here to the remarkable leadership in foundation management which can be traced to Drs. Wallace Buttrick, George Vincent, Wickliffe Rose, Robert D. Ogden, Henry S. Pritchett, Robert S. Woodward, Abraham Flexner, and others, and among the trustees themselves in such men as Walter Hines Page, President Eliot of Harvard, Dr. Welch of Baltimore, Nicholas Murray Butler, and Elihu Root. Much of what I say here tonight has been better said by them.

As one lesson from foundation experience, it is now generally known that the giving of money, in private or in public, must involve a personal responsibility and a personal scrutiny. It has been well said that some one must sweat blood with gift money if it is not to do more harm than good.

Another amazing thing about foundations is that prospective donors, or the directors of newly established foundations, rarely ever establish contacts with the older foundations. If they did, there would be immediately available to them the fruits of thirty years of experience in the systematic business of handling a trust. In the past ten years only three new foundations have made any attempt to learn directly how the Carnegie trusts are operated. Apparently the general idea is that once the money is set up, the rest of the business is easy.

And now what actually goes on in a foundation office? Early in these proceedings let us disclaim for any and all foundations the commonly attributed quality of omniscience or omnipotence. The trustees, within the terms of the trust, determine what shall be the chief fields of interest; that is, what sort of social effort shall have money spent on it; as, for example, hospitals, social service, libraries, medical research, etc. Between the trustees, once they have established

certain policies, and the grant-consuming public, there is interposed an administrative staff, made up generally of a few persons who are more or less trained, at least by educational and administrative experience, to sort the wheat from the endless run of proposals which are presented, either in writing or by word of mouth, by those who seek funds. Day by day an administrative staff is confronted not only with intelligent persons who have well-formulated ideas and projects, but with other intelligent persons, who, assuming that foundation officers are omniscient, wish academic, financial, professional, and personal advice—and very often such things as letters of introduction to wealthy and prominent private citizens. Often it is assumed that foundations are a source of refuge and relief. One day a college president accompanied by the chairman of his board of trustees paid me a call. They had decided to fire the college librarian. Would I please dictate a letter in the name of the Corporation recommending such action. Then neither of my visitors would be held responsible. I had never set foot on the campus, and didn't even know the librarian's name!

It is also of interest to say here that supporters of various proposals sometimes feel it necessary to deluge officers and trustees with explanatory and commendatory letters. Only last week in one day I saw fifteen letters of commendation from people in a Southern State relative to a proposal pending before the Corporation—a highly specialized project, about which only expert advice could count. Obviously, a foundation, after a few years of operation, has its own devices for securing information as to individuals and organizations, and rarely hesitates to do so.

The matter, however, of receiving proposals for grants is only a part of the business of an administrative staff. It is charged by the trustees with the routine of handling the funds, of administering grants once they are made, of checking on them and of estimating in one way or another whether or not the grant has brought forth anything worth while, and reporting on them to the trustees. Some of them carry on

what is officially known as an "audit of experience," which covers not only the progress made under provisions of current grants, such as for the support of certain extension activities in a given State, but the long-time review and retrospective estimate of series of related grants, as for example, grants for chemical and physical research over a twenty-year period. As a matter of experience, foundations estimate that about 65% of grants advance or diffuse knowledge; 25% confirm or negate matters already partially determined; and 10% at least are "flops," "duds," or, to be more dignified, failures.

Foundations rarely have staffs composed of experts—for experts do not lend themselves easily to consideration of the unbelievable variety of opportunity with which a general trust is confronted. Yet expert advice is (in many instances) essential before intelligent action can be taken. Nearly every foundation has its own list of advisers, some generally qualified in a special field, some highly specialized. There are advisory committees, too, and at times even organizations are used as advisory groups. Generally such extra-legal groups are advisory only—not executive—in function, but occasionally they may be asked to organize informally over a period of years and to make definite recommendations to the foundation, based upon their own study and investigation, and to supervise grants, if made. This use of advisers is simply a sharing of the trust by utilizing as far as practicable the best judgment obtainable. From time to time, the personnel of these advisory connections changes greatly. The retention of any one expert in an advisory capacity tends, as a rule, to make him bureaucratic.

In addition to conferences, reading, study, correspondence, and expert advice, a foundation tries to keep itself informed—through the travel and the trained observation of its staff. Colleges, laboratories, museums, libraries, demonstrations must be seen in operation, not on a display basis, if objective judgment is to be attained. Persons through whom funds are being spent need to be seen in their own environment and with their own kind, and the inter-relation of personalities

and abilities as shown in an association meeting, or conference, or round table, is often most illuminating.

Between academic life and the administration of a general endowment, there is a close connection, for most of the permanent staff, as a rule, come from universities, and usually have had experience as university officers.

Foundation people are often accused of being queer. They seem isolated—maybe insulated—from the world in which they are intensely interested. They are not educators, yet they deal with education. They are not philanthropists, yet they help give money away. One scientist has waggishly said, "Maybe they are philanthropoids." They seldom rise to heights of enthusiasm about what they see or hear, for they have learned that evinced enthusiasm, and often even sympathetic listening, is misconstrued into promises and commitments. Rarely do they say a direct "yes" or "no." The story has come down to me that once there was a Scotch foundation official with a glass eye, of which he was unduly proud. He had as a caller one day an Irish college president. The Irishman spoke long, earnestly, and persuasively of the college for which he sought aid. The Scotchman listened, was half-way persuaded, but wished to dodge the issue if possible. Finally, he said to the Irishman: "I don't like your plan very much, and yet it has its good points. Here's what I'll do. One of my eyes is a glass eye—a perfect match, I think, for the other eye. If you will tell me which eye is the glass eye, I'll see that you get the money you want."

"Fair enough," said the Irishman. "I have studied your face and watched your eyes carefully as we have talked and I think I can tell you which eye is the glass one."

"Which?" said the Scotchman.

"The left one," said the Irishman.

"Correct you are," said the Scotchman, "but how in the world did you know that the left eye was the glass eye?"

"Well," said the Irishman, "when I was talking to you it seemed to me that I saw a gleam of sympathy in that eye."

Now what is foundation money spent for? You have seen



today and at other times what the Duke Endowment does, with its interest in hospitals, pensions, orphanages, colleges, and universities. Generally speaking, foundation disbursements are for:

- (1) education, which is the imparting of existing knowledge,
- (2) research, or the formulation of fresh knowledge from original sources, and
- (3) social action which has been defined as education, research and experience put to practical use.

The most general fields of interest to which foundation grants go at present may be said to be medicine and public health, general education, social sciences, physical sciences, social welfare, scholarships and fellowships, international relations, and child welfare.

The real test of the social usefulness of foundations lies, of course, in the particular achievements and improvements—in other words, the positive accomplishments—which may be traceable to their support. No real history of American education can be written without due credit to the General Education Board for its improvement of secondary education in the Southern States. In another field, the same organization reports that conditional gifts of eighty million dollars made by it to colleges, universities, and medical schools have been the cause of contributions of twice that sum from other sources. As a specific study under the auspices of a foundation, probably the most revolutionary and effective educational study ever published was that of Flexner in 1910 on medical education. The story of recent human progress can not be rightly told without recognition to the Rockefeller Institute for its public health work throughout the world. Certainly that unique institution, the American public library, is traceable to the gifts of Mr. Carnegie. And, as an Alabamian speaking to North Carolinians, I must confess my admiration for the work done by the Jeanes, the Slater, and the Rosenwald Funds in improving the facilities for negro education in the Southern States. And the effect of the Duke Endowment in this region is known to all.

I said near the beginning that the place of foundations in modern life—life today—is not generally known. The better established foundations recognize their responsibility to the public and make public an annual record of their grants and their investments, but this is by no means a general practice. I would not for a moment suggest that foundations engage in publicity campaigns to call attention to their work, but merely that the trustees of a public trust should give a regular and intelligible account, adequately distributed, of their stewardship. That foundations are being regarded more closely than hitherto is obvious from recent public statements in the press which indicate that the freedom from taxation which foundations have enjoyed in company with churches and schools is not to be regarded as an unquestioned and inalienable right. In addition, another significant development has taken place. In his report, as President of Carnegie Corporation for the year 1934, Mr. Frederick P. Keppel refers to a statement made by Dr. Henry S. Pritchett in a similar report for 1923 to the effect that one of the basic conditions for the creation of foundations in any country is the social tradition which favors private as against government initiative in philanthropy. The situation today is very different from that of 1923. The government itself has become the greatest philanthropic agency. Mr. Keppel says:

“Not only is there a shift in the sources of support for social and educational experimentation, but the underlying purposes of such experimentation are themselves shifting in these days of rapidly changing values. For a foundation to take sides as to which changes are socially desirable and which modifications in our planning are wise would lead it into the dangerous terrain of indoctrination, if not of active propaganda; but the opportunity to contribute toward the cost of providing factual information upon which the personnel which conducts our many-sided educational and social programs, and the lay public which ultimately pays the bills, may base their conclusions, has thus far constituted one of the great privileges of the foundation. In view of the rôle now played by



government and of the present confusion in men's thinking as to what the next step should be and why, the foundation may well ask themselves what the future has in store for them. In the past, foundation aid has been far from a negligible factor in social progress. It is true that no foundation has been or will ever be ideally organized or ideally directed, and there will always be definite limits as to the uses to which a trust fund may wisely be put. But the foundation has corresponding advantages. It can engage in long-range activities; it can move quickly to meet emergencies; it can turn from creative tasks to relieve distress, as practically all foundations have done in the past three years; and it can turn back, though this has proven to be a much more difficult job. Must the foundations now look forward to an inevitable reduction in the social usefulness of their activities, or can government with its practically unlimited resources and the foundations with their strictly limited funds work profitably together? Or, may the foundations by turning their activities into fields in which government is not as yet a friendly competitor thus maintain their usefulness to society?

"Whatever happens, the foundations can find useful things to do with their funds. They could, if they so decided, return to their earlier practice of contributing to the general purposes of worthy individual institutions; they could expend their existing contributions to the advancement of "pure" scholarship, to fundamental research conducted without reference to practical application. The question which these recent activities have raised has to do with the range of fruitful foundation activity, and it is one which cannot be answered in a day or a year.

"It should be axiomatic that foundation money must be reserved to fill the gaps—the occasions in which the funds needed can be provided from no other source. To discern with complete accuracy just which these occasions are would, however, require a seventh sense which has not been vouchsafed to erring mortals. That mistakes of judgment are often made either as to the importance of the work undertaken, or

the necessity of a foundation contribution, no one realizes better than those in responsible charge of foundations. They hope they may be credited with making every effort to avoid them, and they hope also that in the intelligent public opinion to which all foundations are in the last analysis accountable, such errors of judgment as will inevitably occur may be forgiven in the light of the instances in which the foundation has been the means of providing the funds necessary for some work of permanent usefulness to mankind."

# FOREIGN MARKETS AND THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

J. FRED RIPPY

## I

IN RECENT months the possibility of a self-contained United States has often been discussed without due appreciation of our position in the world's economy. The extent to which we were self-contained during the period 1914-1929 is only partially revealed by the following figures representing the export percentages of our total production of movable goods: 1914, 9.7%; 1919, 15.7%; 1929, 9.8%. Some of our commodities are much more dependent on external markets than others. In 1914 the United States produced eighteen commodities which found more than 10% of their sales abroad. By 1929 the number had increased to twenty-four. These commodities, with the percentage of total production exported, were as follows:

COMMODITY	YEAR	
	1914	1929
1. Lard .....	28.1%	33.3%
2. Canned salmon .....	27.9	12.2
3. Wheat .....	19.1	17.9
4. Leaf tobacco .....	47.2	41.2
5. Cotton .....	62.6	49.2
6. Cigarettes .....	14.3	
7. Rosin .....	62.8	58.6 (1930)
8. Turpentine .....	57.6	50.2 (1930)
9. Gasoline and benzol .....	17.6	13.8
10. Kerosene .....	52.2	35.4
11. Gas and fuel oil .....	17.0	
12. Lubricating oil .....	37.1	31.0
13. Copper .....	54.8	36.4
14. Sewing-machines and accessories .....	31.8	29.8
15. Cash registers and adding machines .....	14.3	23.3
16. Typewriters .....	36.9	41.5
17. Printing machinery .....	18.0	28.4
18. Motor cycles .....	10.5	50.0
19. Sardines .....		53.5
20. Apples .....		14.1
21. Rye .....		23.7

22. <i>Tin plate, etc.</i> .....	13.2
23. <i>Steam locomotives</i> .....	20.8
24. <i>Rubber boots and shoes.</i> .....	12.3
25. <i>Agricultural machinery</i> .....	23.2
26. <i>Automobiles</i> .....	10.1

It will be observed that during the sixteen years under consideration two classes of products—cigarettes, and gas and fuel oil—dropped off the list, but that eight others—sardines, apples, rye, tin plate, steam locomotives, rubber boots and shoes, agricultural machinery, and automobiles—were added. The list for 1929 therefore contains twenty-four commodities which found more than 10% of their market abroad. Six other items on the list increased the proportion of their external sales during the period, while the remaining ten reduced the extent of their dependence on foreign markets.

This itemized statement of our dependence on foreign countries presents only one side of the picture. Imports must also be considered. We can not sell abroad unless we buy in an approximately equal amount. Indeed, since foreign countries or their nationals owe the government and citizens of the United States some twenty-seven billion dollars, it may be necessary for us to buy even more than we sell, to import more than we export. And besides, there are certain commodities which we probably can never produce in quantities adequate to supply our needs. Among these are coffee, tea, bananas, cocoa, sugar, rubber, raw silk, and sisal hemp. Among them also are numerous minerals which form the basis of many of our industries. We depend almost entirely on foreign sources for eight minerals: antimony, chromite, manganese, nickel, tin, asbestos, nitrates, potash; and we are partially dependent on foreign sources for eleven others: mercury, tungsten, barite, china clay, fluorspar, graphite, magnesite, mica, petroleum, pyrites, and talc and soapstone.

## II

Thus it becomes evident that the United States is by no means self-sufficient and that sudden economic isolation would require great and rapid readjustments, causing, temporarily at

least, much poverty and suffering. Statesmen and economists will differ, however, regarding the extent to which the government should assume responsibility with reference to foreign trade, and in regard to the energy and pressure which should be exerted in the effort to regain the position which we held in world trade between 1914 and 1929.

As for our imports, perhaps we could manage to endure a reduction in our consumption of tea, coffee, cocoa, chocolate, sugar, bananas, and silk; but must we not have our Yucatan sisal for binding our wheat, our rubber for automobile tires, wearing apparel, and insulation fixtures, and many of the nineteen enumerated minerals for certain almost necessary industries? Moreover, if our imports are reduced, how shall we ever collect from our foreign debtors? And how shall we export our surplus if we are unwilling to take imports in return?

From the standpoint of our national government, our imports involve three problems. One of them is the adjustment of our tariff, a process that will require the discovery of useful commodities which we do not produce or ought not to continue producing. Another is the maintenance of access to the sources of essential foodstuffs and raw materials which we can not find at home. The third is the collection of our large foreign debt, and is closely related to the tariff question.

### III

The export problem appears to be more difficult of solution than the import problem. The whole world, economically maladjusted largely as the result of the World War and its aftermath of nationalism, is more eager to sell than to buy.

Let us examine the statistics again. Products of our farms which depended to a very considerable extent upon foreign markets in 1929 were:

Cotton .....	49.2%	Rye .....	23.7%
Leaf tobacco .....	41.2	Wheat .....	17.9
Lard .....	33.3	Apples .....	14.1

These figures, however, do not give a complete view of the situation. The export value of these commodities for the

year 1929 must also be examined. In millions of dollars, it was as follows:

Cotton .....	770.8	Lard .....	73.4
Leaf tobacco .....	600.2	Apples .....	33.1
Wheat and flour.....	193.2	Rye .....	3.7

The export value of certain farm products which find their main outlet (namely, more than 90%) in the domestic market must likewise be considered. These commodities, and their export value (in millions of dollars) for 1929, were: pork, 50.3; corn, 35.4; barley, 27.5; and oranges, 18.7.

The total value of agricultural products exported by the people of the United States in 1929 was approximately \$1,693,000,000. And this huge sum revealed a large decline since the World War period, for the annual average for 1916-1920 was \$2,642,000,000!

But this was by no means half the extent of our dependence on export markets. Our manufacturing and extractive industries must now be surveyed. During the five-year period of 1896-1900 their output supplied 33.8% of the exports of the United States, and in 1929 it amounted to 67.2%. Referring again to the table presented at the beginning of this paper, one may observe that in 1929 eighteen of these industries were depending in a large way upon foreign markets for the sale of their products:

Rosin .....	58.6%	(1930)	Cash registers, etc...	23.3%
Sardines .....	53.5		Agricultural	
Turpentine .....	50.2	(1930)	machinery .....	23.3
Motor cycles .....	50.0		Steam locomotives..	20.8
Typewriters .....	41.5		Gasoline, benzol....	13.8
Copper .....	36.4		Tin plate, etc.....	13.2
Kerosene .....	35.4		Rubber boots and	
Lubricating oil.....	31.0		shoes .....	12.3
Sewing-machines ...	29.8		Canned salmon.....	12.2
Printing machinery..	28.4		Automobiles .....	10.1

The total value of the non-agricultural exports of the United States in 1929 was \$3,464,000,000, only a little less than their average annual value during the World-War years and more than twice the total of our agricultural exports for 1929. The combined exports of the United States for that

year were considerably larger than those of England, larger than those of France and Germany combined, and 16% of the world's total exports! The labor of more than three million people was required for a year to produce them and transport them to the ports of embarkation.

Near the end of 1929, however, the export markets of the United States began a rapid contraction, and during the next three years our exports declined more rapidly than those of any other important country. They were only 13% of the world's much diminished total in 1931 and still less in 1932.

#### IV

Can these markets be restored? If so, by what procedure? These are important questions, and upon their answer may depend in considerable measure our economic future. Failure to recover a large portion of our export markets will result in much immediate suffering, and probably in a definite decline in our living standards.

For us, the world may contain, in broad divisions, six export markets. They are: Europe, Asia, Latin America, Africa, Canada, and Oceania, listed in the order of their immediate potential significance. Europe may be twice as important to our exporters as all the rest, for it ordinarily shares about 60% of the world's total of imports, followed by Asia with about 13%, Latin America with some 7%, Africa with 5%, Canada with a little more, and Oceania with a little less, than 3%. Moreover, Canada, Africa, Oceania, and considerable portions of Asia are linked with Europe politically. However, the possibilities of a rise in the living standards of the teeming millions of Asia and of significant increases in the population of Canada, Australia, and Latin America should not be overlooked.

It is hardly conceivable that the people of the United States will deliberately reconcile themselves to a policy of economic isolation. They are more likely to demand a recovery of the lost markets for their exports and to call upon the national government for support. *Laissez faire* appears to be



a vanishing doctrine. Questions of tariffs and currencies will of course involve government action, but it is also probable that the authorities at Washington will be urged to negotiate agreements relative to the limitation of production and the distribution of markets. In short, they may be asked to undertake a bit of economic planning world-wide in scope.

## v

One may reasonably contend that the task of finding a market for the surplus products of our agriculture will become the most urgent administrative problem faced by the national government with reference to our foreign trade. The industrial leaders are able to do much effective shifting for themselves. They possess wider experience and are better organized. The farmer's plight is worse than theirs: he was the first to suffer from falling prices, and the value of his exports has decreased steadily and enormously since 1920. Moreover, the restoration of the purchasing power of the farmers will result in great benefit to our industries.

Of all the surplus products of our farms, perhaps wheat has become the most difficult problem. The world production of this cereal has expanded rapidly, numerous countries have soil and climate adapted to its growth, and in periods of depression it may be displaced in no small degree by substitutes. The world total of wheat production, excluding Russia and China, increased from 1,878,000,000 bushels in 1890-1891 to 3,771,000,000 in 1931-1932. Russia increased its production in that period from 212,000,000 bushels to 989,000,000 (1930-1931). The growth in China's production is unknown, as is likewise the quantity produced by this populous country in 1931-1932. It is likely, however, that the world wheat crop for that year was not far short of five and one-half billion bushels.

The principal exporters of wheat are Canada, Argentina, the United States, and Australia. Between 1890-1891 and 1931-1932 the increase in their total production was as follows: the United States, from 378 million bushels to 900 mil-



lion; Canada, from 42 million to 304; Argentina, from 31 to 210; and Australia, from 27 million to 190 million.

There are two possibilities of securing relief: expansion of markets and limitation of production. These four exporting countries will probably find it impossible to increase their sales in Continental Europe, for during the depression the Europeans have expanded their production of cereals. The wheat crop of Europe was about 11% larger in 1930 than during the period 1909-1913. The Europeans are aspiring toward self-sufficiency in this respect, and the trend toward a stationary or probably a declining population in Europe will tend also to level off the market. Canada and Australia may profit, however, by imperial agreements with England and thus leave the situation even worse for the United States and Argentina. Asia and Latin America may offer better prospects for market expansion, but the future here will depend upon rising purchasing power and developing tastes for wheat and wheat products.

It would seem advisable for the four major exporting countries to attempt to negotiate a joint agreement providing for a limitation of production.\* They should be careful, however, not to lose sight of the fact that any decided rise in wheat prices will tend in other countries to stimulate simultaneously an increase in production and a search for substitutes.

The problem of finding markets for and controlling the production of cotton and tobacco should prove less perplexing. The United States is the major producer and the major exporter of both commodities. For many years we have grown more than one half of the world's cotton and about a third of its tobacco. Our only important rivals in the production of raw cotton are India and Egypt, which are both subject to the control of a single power, and it is unlikely that any other important areas of production will be developed in the near future. The situation is analogous in respect to tobacco. The

\* Apparently some progress was made in such negotiations at the London Economic Conference of 1933.

Dutch East Indies and British India rank next to the United States in the production and export of tobacco, but the crop of these areas combined is scarcely as large as that of the United States. Other producers of the weed, though quite numerous, are individually of minor importance. Moreover, the highly organized tobacco manufacturers may be relied upon to find markets for their finished product, and hence to continue their demand for leaf tobacco.

If it should seem desirable to effect a decided reduction in the total output of cotton and tobacco, this would require negotiation between only a few powers: the United States and England in the case of cotton; the United States, Great Britain, and the Netherlands, and possibly Greece and Turkey, in the case of tobacco.

Such are a few of the international problems confronted by the Roosevelt administration in the field of economics. Their proper solution may determine whether grass shall grow in the streets of some of our towns and cities, and whether a fourth of our South and West may become a desert.

## THE SOUTHERN LADY'S LIBRARY, 1700-1776

JULIA CHERRY SPRUILL

COLONIAL women, who were more expert with the needle than the pen, and skilled in the "mysteries of cookerie" rather than the art of composition, were not accustomed to airing their ideas in print or even of confiding them to diaries or private letters. Therefore, they left few personal records of themselves. If, however, little information regarding them is to be had from what they wrote, revealing evidence is available in the books they read. Occasionally in the private correspondence, journals, wills, and inventories of colonial gentlemen, and frequently in newspaper advertisements of colonial booksellers, one finds the names of writing designed for the "fair sex." These ladies' books, many of which have been preserved, throw considerable light upon the woman of colonial days and make known to us, if not what she was, at least what she was supposed to be.

In accordance with the English tradition that a woman should have "knowinge of the lawe of God" sufficient to "withstonde the perilles of the sowle," the colonial lady generally had for her use a Bible and Prayer Book, and often owned *The Whole Duty of Man*, which afforded her private devotions for various occasions, and careful directions, corroborated by the Scriptures, for the conduct of the different members of her household. A library typical of the collections of devout gentlewomen of the early part of the century was that of Mistress Mary Degge, a wealthy spinster, who in 1716 bequeathed these volumes to her nieces: *The Whole Duty of Man*, *The Practice of Piety*, *Meditations on Eternity*, the *Book of Common Prayer*, *The Art of Contentment*, *The Ladies Calling*, Lord Halifax's *Advice to a Daughter*, and William Sherlock's *Practical Discourse concerning Death*. In the decades immediately preceding the Revolution, pious ladies fortified their souls with Dr. Watts's *Psalms and Hymns*, the

Reverend James Hervey's *Meditations and Contemplations*, Elizabeth Burnet's *A Method of Devotion*, Elizabeth Rowe's *Devout Exercises of the Heart*, a Mrs. Stewart's *Meditations upon Several Texts of Scriptures*, and the sermons of Archbishop Tillotson and the Reverend George Whitefield.

The works which constituted the greater part of the library of seventeenth-century gentlewomen and held an important place on the shelves of ladies throughout the following century were handbooks on domestic economy, most of which were printed in England and imported into the colonies. These furnished the lady with complete instructions pertaining to her position as housewife; or, as claimed in the title of one manual, they contained "all the inward and outward virtues which ought to be in a compleate woman." *The Accomplished Lady's Delight in Preserving, Physick, Beautifying, Cookery, and Gardening* discussed the various branches of housewifery. Part I described the art of preserving and candying fruits and flowers and of making conserves, syrups, jellies, and pickles. Part II, called "The Physical Cabinet," contained recipes in "Physic and Chyrurgery" and "Beautifying Waters." This part must have been particularly interesting to colonial ladies living on isolated plantations, for it gave them detailed instructions for making in their own homes all kinds of "Oyles, Oynments and Powders to Adorn and add Loveliness to the Face and Body," numerous formulas for making the teeth white and sound and the breath sweet, and other recipes "to prevent the marks of small-pox," "to make the Nails grow," "to make the Breasts small," and "to make the Body fat and comely." Part III, "The Complete Cook's Guide," included directions for dressing all kinds of flesh, fowl, and fish, both in the English and the French mode with their proper sauces and "sallads," and "the making of Pyes, Pasties, Tarts and Custards, with many of their forms and Shapes." Part IV, "The Lady's Diversion in her Garden," contained, besides "choice Curiosities relating to Plants and Flowers," instructions for the "nice Adorning Balconies, Tur-

rets, and Windows, with Flowers, or Greens, every Month in the Year."

The manual advertised oftenest in colonial newspapers was E. Smith's *The Compleat House-wife: or Accomplished Gentlewoman's Companion*. From its full title we learn that it was a "Collection of upwards of Five Hundred of the Most Approved Receipts in Cookery, Pastry, Confectionary, Preserving, Pickles, Cakes, Creams, Jellies, Made Wines, Cordials," and that it included nearly two hundred family recipes for drinks, syrups, salves, ointments, and "many other things of Sovereign and approved Efficacy in most Distempers, Pains, Achs, Wounds, Sores," which recipes were intended both for the use of private families and for "such Publick-Spirited Gentlewoman as would be beneficent to their Poor Neighbors." Fortunate was the lady who possessed this comprehensive volume, for, besides these numerous recipes, it contained "a scheme engraven on copper plate" for the proper arrangement of dishes on the table, bills of fare for every month, and instructions in other practical matters such as a "method of boiling Plate" and of "destroying Buggs."

Almost as popular as *The Compleat Housewife* was Martha Bradley's *British Housewife: or, the Cook, Housekeeper's, and Gardiner's Companion*. Besides instructions in all the branches of cookery, it contained discussions of the "Art of marketing"; the "Nature of all Kinds of Foods, and the Method of suiting them to different Constitutions"; the "polite and easy Manner of doing the Honours of the Table"; the "Conduct of a Family in Respect of Health, the Disorders to which they are every Month liable, and the most approved Remedies for each"; the breeding and feeding of beasts and fowls; and the "Management of the pleasant, profitable, and useful Garden." The whole was "embellished" with curious copper plates illustrating the manner of trussing game and fowls and the order of setting tables so that, explained the author, those unable to read might instruct themselves. Similar works often advertised were Mrs. Glasse's *Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy*, Mrs. Brooke's *Cookery*, and Mrs.

Harrison's *Housekeeper's Pocket Book, and Complete Family Cook*.

Housewifery manuals, which constituted almost the entire library of ladies of the earlier part of the period, as the century advanced, came to be superseded somewhat by instructions in social conduct and works of more general improvement and entertainment. In the eighteenth century in England, and to a lesser extent in America, domestic economy declined as the all-absorbing interest of gentlewomen, and their attention came to be called more to the "embellishment" of their minds. A very popular subject in the periodicals was the means of improving the "fair sex," and numerous articles appeared describing the reading suitable to the "female character." A correspondent to the *Maryland Gazette*, observing that generally the ladies knew little more than "a small Share of Housewifery" and "a great deal of Gossiping," proposed to "divert their Minds from useless Trifles" and "furnish their Breasts with valuable Knowledge." As the literature usually available was either too "loose" or too "serious" for ladies, he promised to "intice them to reading" with writings more agreeable to their modesty and taste.

More descriptive of the prevailing ideas was the proposal of Sir Richard Steele, who, as a means of furnishing the sex with "reflections and sentiments proper for the companions of reasonable men," recommended a "Female Library," which would "consist of such authors as do not corrupt while they divert, but shall tend more immediately to improve them as they are women." His collection of books, he promised, would be "such as shall not hurt a feature by the austerity of their reflections, nor cause one impertinent glance by the wantonness of them. They shall all tend to advance the value of their innocence as virgins, improve their understanding as wives, and regulate their tenderness as parents . . . the whole shall be so digested for the use of my students, that they shall not go out of character for their inquiries, but their knowledge appear only a cultivated innocence."

The ladies' books most widely circulated in the Southern

Colonies conformed admirably to Steele's idea. They were unquestionably designed for members of the female sex, and by no means could they be said to cause ladies to wrinkle their brows or spoil their features by mental activity. On the contrary, they furnished their readers no necessity for reflection or inquiry, but gave them specific and final instructions on all matters with which they were supposed to have any concern.

Of the guides to morality and decorum, the most outstanding was *The Ladies Calling*, which for over a century was accepted in England and America as final authority on the nature and duties of women. The views it set forth were approved by almost every writer on woman's education, and whole passages of its text were paraphrased or incorporated verbatim in many publications which followed it. It may be accepted as truly expressive of the prevailing colonial conception of woman and as representative of the best of the ladies' books. The first part was an exaltation of the virtues which, according to the divine command, were the proper "Ornaments of Women"; the second described the duties of the sex in each of their several estates, virginity, marriage, and widowhood. The author held that women "in respect of their intellects" were "below men," but allowed them souls "of as divine an Original, as endless a Duration" as those of men. Indeed, "in respect to their eternal well-being," he declared, God gave them advantages over men, for he implanted in them "some native propensions" to virtue and "closelier fenced them in" from temptations and "those wider excursions, for which the customary liberties of the other sex afford a more open way." This notion that women have "peculiar aptnesses" toward goodness and that masculine and feminine virtues are different underlay his whole conception of woman's rights and responsibilities.

The virtues described as peculiarly feminine were modesty, meekness, compassion, affability, and piety. A breach of modesty, it was stated, appeared in "indecentcy of loquacity," "unhandsome earnestness or a loudness of discourse," and in



"virile boldness" or "daring manliness" in speech, manner, or dress. Modesty as opposed to wantonness was presented as "the most indispensable requisite of a woman; a thing so essential and natural to the sex, that every the least declination from it, is proportionable receding from Womanhood." Meekness was especially enjoined of women because they were placed by God and nature in a position of inferiority to the other sex. Compassion, affability, and piety were also deemed particularly appropriate for the sex not only because of their "native tenderness" but also because of their exemption from public employments, which required sternness in men. Men, it was explained, had many cares, both private and public, to distract them from pious reflections, while the most that was usually required of women was but "a little easy inspection within their own walls" and "the oversight of a few children."

Quite in keeping with these ideas of the character of women were the views of their duties. The young maid was reminded that modesty and obedience were "the two grand Elements essential to the Virgin State," that her look, speech, and behavior should "own an humble distrust of herself," and that she should beware of "mischievous curiosity" and, regarding "indecent Things," affect ignorance. She was advised against romances, which aroused the "amorous Passions," and was admonished to spend her time on "the offices of Piety," "Household Managery," and "ornamental improvements" like writing, needle-work, and music. A fundamental rule laid down for virgins was that they should never listen to any proposal of marriage made to them directly but should direct all such overtures from themselves to their parents, not only because parents had such a "native right" in them that it would be unjust as well as disobedient to dispose of themselves without their consent, but also because such procedure was "most agreeable to the virgin modesty," which would make marriage an act rather of their obedience than of their choice. "Superannuated Virgins" were consoled with the suggestion that if they would behave themselves with gravity and "addict themselves to piety" they would give the

world cause to believe that it was not their necessity but their choice that kept them unmarried.

The chief duty of the wife was obedience, which was required of her, both because she promised it in her marriage vow and because subjection was the punishment laid upon all wives by the first woman's disobedience. In addition to submitting to the will of her husband, she was admonished to guard his reputation by "setting his Worth in the clearest light" and "putting his infirmities in the shade." She was warned to guard against jealousy and to "put the most candid construction upon any doubtful action" of her husband. If the proof of his infidelity were thrust upon her, she had the consolation of being no longer in doubt and might find comfort in patient submission. Not "virulence or recrimination," but a "wise dissimulation" or "very calm notice" was suggested as the most likely means of reclaiming him. If a virtuous wife were to suffer from the causeless jealousy of her husband, she was to accept this traducing of her innocence as God's punishment for some other sin she might have committed, and contrive to relieve her husband of the torture of jealousy by denying herself even the most innocent liberties which might cause him uneasiness.

The wife's duty did not end with the death of her husband. As a widow she was instructed to revive the memory of all that was praiseworthy in him, to vindicate him from calumny, and to be careful to do nothing unworthy of his name. She was to retreat from the world, "put on a more retir'd temper of mind, a more strict behaviour," and "abound in works of Piety and Charity." Although admitting that the remarriage of widows was not forbidden by the Scriptures, the author argued against it, declaring that she who had a good husband might reasonably doubt that in "this common dearth of Vertue" two good husbands would fall to any woman's lot, and, on the other hand, she who had a bad one should find caution enough against a new venture in the memory of what she had suffered. Yet experience showed, he declared, that

women, though the weaker sex, had fortitude enough to "baffle all these considerations."

Another little book which dictated the rules of conduct to ladies for well over a century was Lord Halifax's *The Lady's New Year's Gift, or, Advice to a Daughter*, which, though less religious in character, was very similar in its conception of woman's nature and mission. So popular was it in England that between 1688 and 1765 it ran through fifteen editions and in the colonies it was frequently listed in inventories and newspaper advertisements. Though it described the proper female virtues and discussed general behavior, it concerned itself chiefly with the subject of "How to live with a husband." Underlying the whole discussion was its view of the difference between the sexes: "You must first lay it down for a Foundation in general, That there is *Inequality* in the *Sexes*, and that for the better Oeconomy of the World, the *Men*, who were to be the Law Givers, had the better share of *Reason* bestow'd upon them; by which means your Sex is the better prepar'd for the *Compliance* that is necessary for the better performance of those *Duties* which seem to be most properly assign'd to it. . . . We are made of differing *Tempers*, that our Defects may the better be Mutually Supplied: Your *Sex* wanteth our Reason for your *Conduct*, and our *Strength* for your Protection; Ours wanteth your *Gentleness* to soften and to entertain us." Although this distribution of powers might at first glance seem unjust, it explained, really women have the advantage, for they have it in their power to subdue their masters and without violence throw both their natural and legal authority at their feet. "You have more strength in your *Looks*," the sex was assured, "than we have in our *Laws*, and more power by your *tears*, than we have by our *Arguments*."

Since it was settled by law and custom that woman was to be subject to masculine authority and since one of the disadvantages of her sex was that she seldom might choose the man she married, it was most necessary that she be instructed how to make the best of whatever might fall to her lot. There-

fore, for her direction, hints were given of the most ordinary causes of dissatisfaction between man and wife with suggestions as to how she might cure, or at least endure, whatever frailties her husband might have. If he should prove to be a philanderer, she was to "affect ignorance" of his infidelities. Should he be a drunkard, she was to be thankful that he had some faults, which would most likely soften the arrogance of his nature and throw a veil over her own weaknesses. If he proved to be "Cholerick and Ill-hunour'd," she was to "take care of increasing the Storm by an unwary Word," and seek to reclaim him by smiles and flattery. Even the most difficult type of husband, "a close-handed Wretch," was not an "incurable grievance," for no man was so addicted to avarice that he would not at some time become prodigal, and an appeal to his vanity or ambition at these "Critical Moments," or sometimes a dose of wine, would work upon his "tough Humour." If he should be weak-minded, she was to take consolation in the thought that she made "a better figure, for her Husband's making no great one," and that his incompetence gave her dominion if she made the right use of it. But, while governing, she was advised by all means to let it appear to him and to the world that he still held the reins.

A much more pretentious book appearing repeatedly on colonial booksellers' lists was *The Lady's Library*. Though advertised as "Written by a Lady" and published by Richard Steele, it was really a compilation of lengthy passages appropriated from a number of other writers. The ideas it set forth were generally those of *The Ladies Calling* and Lord Halifax's *Advice*, whole sections of which it incorporated as a part of its text.

Another popular writing was *The Gentleman and Lady Instructed*. The part devoted to the lady was a graphic and witty picture of the common foibles of the sex followed by directions for their proper conduct. Its "Regulations of their Daily Actions" described the appropriate employments of the gentlewoman. She was to rise early and, after "discharging her duty to God," spend her time in the management of

her household. After dinner she was permitted to embroider, or even read, for, it explained, "though Women should not pretend to commence Doctors," they should not "forswear knowledge nor make a Vow of Stupidity." She was cautioned, however, not to "rival the knowledge of the Sybils, nor the Science of the Muses," nor "wade too deep into Controversy, nor soar so high as Divinity," for these studies "lie out of a lady's Way: They fly up to the Head, and not only intoxicate weak Brains, but turn them." As a diversion she might return visits or receive them, but she was admonished to avoid long conversations as "Women seldom have Materials to furnish a long Discourse, unless they comment upon their Neighbour's failures." She was also warned to avoid discoursing of love intrigues with the explanation: "the Laws of *Decorum* are so severe in regard to Women, that it's almost a Fault to pronounce the Word Love."

During the decade preceding the American Revolution two new books appearing regularly in booksellers' announcements were Dr. Gregory's *A Father's Legacy to his Daughter* and the Reverend James Fordyce's *Sermons to Young Women*. In these writings, which glorified the "amiable weaknesses of the sex" and held up masculinity as the most displeasing characteristic ladies could possess, one finds some explanation of the false modesty, affected sensibility, and exaggerated sex consciousness which characterized many women of the period. The *Legacy*, advertised as written by "a tender Father, in a declining state of health," was intended, the author stated, to inform his daughter regarding those "virtues and accomplishments" which rendered her "most amiable in the eyes" of his own sex. It emphasized a "soft delicacy" and an "exquisite sensibility" as among the chief excellencies of women and considered piety peculiarly necessary for them not only because of their "natural softness and sensibility," the sheltered condition of their lives, and their particular need of both the restraints and supports of religion, but also because men regarded irreligion as "odious in women," as "proof of that

hard and masculine spirit," which of all their faults they disliked most.

The book gave advice on such subjects as dress, amusements, general conduct in society, and marriage, reminding the reader always that a "modest reserve" and a "retiring delicacy" were her most attractive characteristics. It declared that wit was the most dangerous talent a girl could possess, thus admonishing her: "Be even careful in displaying your *good sense*. It will be thought you assume a superiority over the rest of the company. But if you happen to have any learning, keep it a profound secret, especially from the men, who generally look with a jealous and malignant eye on a woman of great parts and a cultivated understanding." Bodily vigor, also unfeminine, was likewise to be concealed. "Though good health be one of the greatest blessings of life," it cautioned, "never make a boast of it; but enjoy it in grateful silence. We so naturally associate the idea of female softness and delicacy with a correspondent delicacy of constitution, that when a woman speaks of her great strength, her extraordinary appetite, her ability to bear excessive fatigue, we recoil at the description, in a way she is little aware of."

The same nicety was advised in courtship and marriage. For a woman to admit that she was in love was not "consistent with the perfection of female delicacy." Even after marriage she should not declare the full extent of her love for her husband, for it would produce in him "satiety and disgust." In matters of marriage, it explained, women have little choice since it is a maxim that love is not to begin on their part; but though they have not the privilege of choosing whom they may love, they have been endowed by nature with a "greater flexibility of taste" which makes it possible for them to love whatever person prefers them.

The *Sermons* were saturated with the same sickly sentimentality as that which pervaded the *Legacy*. Fordyce extolled the "submissive dependence," "timidity of temper," "lovely meekness," "modest pliancy," and "complacent deportment" of the sex, who, he declared, were "formed to delight us



[men], not so much by an emulation of intellects, as by external graces and decorations, united with the softer virtues of the heart, and the sprightlier charms of fancy."

In spite of their exaggerated notions of feminine delicacy and unnatural standards of conduct these books were exceedingly popular. No lady's library was complete without them, and they were sometimes used as reading in girls' schools. They were welcomed in the colonies as expressing a "new and more refined" attitude toward the sex, and not only dictated the rules of female decorum during the period just before the Revolution, but, handed down from generation to generation, they had an incalculable influence in fixing the conception of the proper nature of women throughout the following century.

Somewhat similar to the *Legacy* was *The Lady's Preceptor*, a polite guide to social conduct. Regarding behavior in church, it reminded the reader that it was not the business of a lady to concern herself about rites and ceremonies or to pass judgment on the sermon, but to listen to the minister with gravity and manifest a desire for information. Rules for her demeanor in company were: to avoid mimicing others, whispering or laughing unless everyone present were acquainted with the occasion, to abstain from gossip and a spirit of contradiction, which, while disagreeable in everyone, was especially so in the "fair sex," and to "endeavour that Cheerfulness, Sweetness, and Modesty be always blended" in her "Countenance and Air." It gave special directions for her conduct with men, warning her never to be alone in their company, especially with only one, and to "be careful of maintaining that strict Watch over your Eyes, Words and Heart, that they may not in the least perceive you have any particular Regard for them." Men, it warned, took great pleasure in being thought irresistible lovers and in gaining victories over "the most rigid virtue"; therefore, the young lady should put little confidence in what they promised and when fine things were said to her should acquit herself "by a gentle Smile



accompanied with a Blush to shew that you are neither a Prude or a Coquette."

Besides these writings on general conduct, every one of which gave copious advice on the proper treatment of husbands, there were specific guides to "conjugal felicity," the most frequently mentioned of which were Dean Swift's *A Letter to a Very Young Lady on her Marriage* and Mrs. Chapone's *Letter to a New-Married Lady*. Swift's letter, while contemptuous of women generally, was a sincere attempt to give helpful advice to a young friend. It was said that the lady to whom it was addressed did not appreciate it as a compliment either to herself or her sex, but it was so favorably regarded by the public that it was printed in America as well as in England. Summarized briefly its suggestions to the bride were: to avoid displaying affection for her husband in public, affecting uneasiness during his absence, or demanding letters from him by every post while he was abroad; to be careful of her dress; to take into her confidence no "she-companions" but let her associates be of the masculine sex and chosen by her husband; and to keep herself informed of her husband's income and keep within her allowance rather than be like "those politic ladies, who think they gain a great point when they have teased their husbands to buy them a new equipage, a laced head, or a fine petticoat, without once considering what long scores remain unpaid to the butcher." Swift's primary advice, however, and the part, probably, to which the young bride objected, was an explanation of the way in which she might improve her mind and thus become "a reasonable and agreeable companion" for her husband.

Mrs. Chapone disagreed with Dr. Gregory's idea that a wife should conceal her affection for her husband and with Swift and the other male writers on marriage, almost everyone of whom, she declared, held that love in man was infallibly destroyed by possession and subsisted but a short time after marriage. Admitting, however, an inevitable abatement, she urged the bride to cultivate respect and affection and build the solid foundation of friendship while passion was subsiding,

and offered suggestions as to how she might make herself agreeable to her husband. Unlike the masculine advisers, Mrs. Chapone recognized the bride's difficulties in adjusting to her "in-laws" and, while advising her to strive to adopt her husband's sentiments regarding his relations, and to take care that no dispute ever arise between his mother and herself, she approved of the husband who declined to have his mother live with him after his marriage and advised the young wife thus to deal with her mother-in-law: "If she should desire to control your actions, or to intermeddle in the affairs of your family, more than you think is reasonable, hear her advice with patience, and answer with respect, but in a manner that may let her see you mean to judge of your own duties for yourself."

Topics like marriage and politeness in society constituted the subject matter of most ladies' books widely circulated in the colonies. The subversive writings of Bathsua Makin, Mary Astell, and others advocating the higher education of women were apparently not popular. Yet, while the colonists generally disapproved of "pedantic females" and "petticoated philosophers," they welcomed those conservative writers who presented an expurgated and restricted program of "female learning." Mrs. Chapone's *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind*, Lady Pennington's *A Mother's Advice to her Absent Daughters*, and *The Polite Lady* of anonymous authorship were on sale regularly in colonial bookshops. These writings may be accepted as descriptive of the prevailing ideals for the education of gentlewomen from the middle of the century until far into the next. Mrs. Chapone, recognizing the tendency of all too many of her sex to mistake indolence and stupidity for feminine delicacy and innocence, held up for disapproval vain women who make themselves ridiculous by their affectation of sensibility, and who, disclaiming all knowledge of times and dates, take pride in their ignorance. Yet she would not have the lady learned. Subjects recommended for her were the ornamental accomplishments such as dancing, music, drawing, French and Italian, and history, natural philosophy, moral philosophy, and poetry. She considered the

learned languages unsuitable, explaining: "the Labour and time which they require are generally incompatible with our natures and proper employments. . . . The danger of pedantry and presumption in a woman—of her exciting envy in one sex and jealousy in the other—of her exchanging the graces of imagination for the severity and preciseness of a scholar, would be, I own, sufficient to frighten me from the ambition of seeing my girl remarkable for learning."

Lady Pennington, while asserting that the management of domestic affairs was "certainly the most proper business of women," argued that learning would not "render them useless wives and impertinent companions." Besides the studies suggested by Mrs. Chapone, she advised that the lady have a sufficient understanding of geography to prevent her from making humiliating blunders in conversation, and that she be "perfect in the four first rules of arithmetic." "More she would never have occasion for," she explained, "and her mind should not be burdened with needless Application."

A more pretentious work was *The Polite Lady*, which, written in the form of letters from a mother called "Portia" to her daughter "Sophia," discussed the studies proper for the young lady, her choice of friends, dress, and conduct. It suggested that a lady's dress should be modest, fashionable, and by all means feminine. Those "cavalier ladies" who "assume the coat and periwig, the hat and feather," it declared, were as ridiculous as "men in petticoats." It recommended the same studies as Mrs. Chapone and Lady Pennington, explaining the usefulness of each. Dancing was necessary because it gave a natural and graceful air to all the motions of the body and enabled one to behave in company with modest assurance and address; drawing improved the imagination and furnished patterns for embroidery; French was so much the language of the fashionable world that the lady who did not speak it made a very awkward figure in society. Still, the author would not have women "so knowing as men," for, she explained, "as our sphere of action is more narrow and confined, so our knowledge may be more slight and superficial."

The ladies' books so far discussed were written as sermons or lectures, and made no attempt to conceal the fact that their purpose was instruction rather than entertainment. Others sought to make their teaching more palatable by presenting it in such a disguised form that the reader would scarcely be conscious of being improved while she was being amused. Such a work found in colonial libraries and often in colonial bookshelves was *Sophronia, or Letters to the Ladies*, which gave instruction, not in "a dry bead-roll of precepts," it claimed, but in animated letters written by a happy matron, who advised her correspondents out of her own experience on the subject of domestic relations. *Fables for the Female Sex* by Edward Moore presented the rules of female decorum in amusing little morality tales. One versified tale warned wives against becoming careless of their dress; another illustrated the oft-repeated maxim that a woman can never regain her honor after it is once lost; and still another, called "The Owl and the Nightingale," in which the domestic nightingale who "minds the duties of her nest" enjoys the approval of man and bird, while the pedantic owl is held up to scorn, made clear the prevailing disapproval of the learned lady.

The *Female Spectator*, also designed to entertain as well as instruct, was quite popular in the colonies. Besides discussions of the usual subjects deemed specially interesting to ladies, it presented romantic little episodes each inculcating a moral. The unhappy *Seomanthe*, who having been brought up by a prudish aunt, eloped with a worthless adventurer, illustrated the danger of confining girls too closely. The ruin of the unfortunate *Erminia*, an innocent girl, trapped and seduced by a man disguised as her brother, demonstrated the danger of masquerades. The story of *Alithea, Doriman, and Melissa* showed how a wife might reclaim her unfaithful husband. Instead of displaying jealousy, the discreet *Alithea* feigned ignorance of *Doriman's* philandering, and when his mistress, *Melissa*, had a child, *Alithea* went to the midwife to whom it had been given, brought it home and cared for it as her own. *Doriman*, overwhelmed by her prudence and gener-

osity, cast off his heartless and wicked mistress, and returned to his faithful and forgiving wife. Similar stories illustrated the dire effects of vanity, immodest behavior, and gaming, and of a woman's attempting to overstep her preordained sphere.

A publication providing intellectual stimulus and diversion was *The Ladies Diary*, a new edition of which seems to have been printed with the Virginia Almanac each year. *The Virginia Gazette*, June 30, 1768 advertised the forthcoming number for the year 1769 as containing a "Variety of improving and entertaining Particulars, such as Enigmas, Acrosticks, Rebusses, Queries, Paradoxes, Nosegays of Flowers, Plates of Fruit, Mathematical Questions, &c. &c.," and in the following February announced the winner of the award offered for the best answer in verse to the prize enigma. The successful lady, who signed her name as "Isabella," was desired to send to the printer for the ten copies of the *Ladies Diary* offered as prize, or, if she preferred, to wait and have ten copies of those printed the following year.

Besides these various ladies' books, there were on sale bound volumes of a London periodical called *The Lady's Magazine*, which was evidently intended to be for women what *The Gentleman's Magazine* was for their husbands. No available record furnishes more revealing evidence than this monthly, not only of the literary taste of ladies of the period but also of the prevailing attitude regarding their intellectual and social status. In the prefatory address of the first number the editor gave a forecast of his publication by means of which he proposed to "render the minds of the sex not less amiable than their persons." The persons were not to be neglected, however, for, he explained, "as external appearance is the first inlet to the treasures of the heart," he intended to present them with "most elegant patterns for the Tambour, Embroidery, or every kind of Needlework" and with illustrations of all the "fluctuations of fashions." Those living in the country were to be kept informed of "every innovation that is made in the female dress, whether it respects the covering

of the head, or the cloathing of the body." For the instruction of their minds he promised to "ransack every branch of literature" to find interesting stories that would "confirm chastity and recommend virtue."

The magazine itself was not very different from ladies' magazines of today. Regular features were: a travel story entitled "A Sentimental Journey by a Lady"; a life story of some contemporary woman and an historical account of some famous woman of antiquity under the heading, "The Lady's Biography"; a collection of maxims for female conduct called "The Oeconomy of Female Life"; an article called "The Female Rambler," which was a discussion of some subject like "female duties"; and a section called "The Lady's Housemaid. Or Housekeeper's Calendar," which was a collection of menus and recipes "embellished" with a full-page engraving of the arrangement of dishes for a first and second course for the month. Besides these special articles, there were miscellaneous essays, morality tales, enigmatical questions, confectionery recipes, patterns, charts, and directions for embroidery, netting, and other needlework, and full-page illustrations of the latest fashions.

Of even greater interest to ladies, perhaps, than this periodical were the romances, large numbers of which poured into the colonies during the last half of the century. In England the reading of romances was so widespread that every writer on woman's education took occasion to condemn it. The newly established circulating libraries, which dealt largely in these "fictitious stories," were denounced as "evergreen trees of diabolical knowledge," and the novel-reading girl with her fanciful ideas, affected manners, and general preciosity, became a comic type in the literature of the day. In the colonies, also, journalists felt it necessary to point out the evils in "these damn'd story-books," but the same papers which published their protests carried announcements of circulating libraries appealing for the patronage of ladies and booksellers' advertisements of long lists of the objectionable tales.

It is not to be imagined that all ladies of the Southern



Colonies confined their reading entirely to the works specially prepared for their sex. The few who had any real interest in books probably became acquainted with standard works in history, travel, science, philosophy, and English literature, many of which were sometimes found in colonial libraries. The wife of Councillor Carter of "Nomini Hall" in Virginia was said to have read habitually more than the parson of the parish. Mrs. William Hooper, wife of the signer of the Declaration of Independence from North Carolina, was described as possessing a great knowledge of history and such other "accomplishments of mind" as to efface completely the first impression made by her lack of beauty and "very ordinary appearance." Martha Laurens of South Carolina, besides being acquainted with the best in English literature, was known to have read the New Testament in Greek with her sons and in French with her daughters. Eliza Lucas Pinckney of the same colony found pleasure in the works of Plutarch, Virgil, and Locke, and even delved into the study of law. But these women were conspicuous as exceptions to the general rule. Colonial women ordinarily read very little. Intellectual attainments were not expected of "the weaker sex" and works like *The Ladies Calling* and *The Compleat-Housewife* contained all that the most exemplary gentlewoman was expected to know.



## METAPHYSIC AND PIRANDELLO

E. C. KNOWLTON

THOMAS HARDY in *The Dynasts* from time to time takes the reader to a station above Europe and lets him watch simultaneous events in different parts of Europe during the Napoleonic era. A bird's-eye view reveals the interweaving of human destinies from England south to the Mediterranean and east to Russia. In turn, Hardy affords close views of what was going on with peasants in English villages or with Nelson on shipboard off Trafalgar or with royalty in a palace of Vienna.

This discussion has in mind to survey a similar large pattern, though a less picturesque one in that it concerns the realm of literary thought. It begins with Goethe and follows a course through the nineteenth century toward Pirandello. Only those strands in the pattern are emphasized which converge on Pirandello or define his position. For the sake of clarity, over-simplification may perhaps be forgiven.

### I

An American confronted with the culture of the continental nations is likely to be surprised at the interest that the French have in ideas, the Germans in philosophies of life, the Italians in subtle speculation about art. He has to adjust himself to what appears to be a normal and rather common seriousness of attitude toward literature and drama. There is little dealing with ready-made speculations. Each work of art represents an achievement in some form of thought.

A convenient word for the product or idea as embodied in a play or in prose fiction is *metaphysic*. It may be the starting-point for an author who wishes to clothe the idea in human flesh, or it may become implicitly apparent as the author merely records the life of a group of individuals as truly as he can. More attention is directed to the inner life or reality

of the central figures than to a multitude of physical or realistic details.

The golden mean or temperance—nothing in excess—is a most pervasive metaphysic in older literature, and it has taken on a fresh aspect with our interest in supermen. Other familiar metaphysics are "Character is Fate," and "Follow Nature, or Reason."

## II

Luigi Pirandello, when he left Italy to study at the University of Bonn, went to a land of metaphysic par excellence, and he became proficient in philosophy. German literature from the days of Lessing has concerned itself with philosophies of living and has engaged itself in applying systematic philosophy to life. This is true of prose fiction and drama, fields in which Pirandello has distinguished himself. If we trace a portion of the pattern of literary thought, we shall not only go over ground that Pirandello covered but also perceive his significance more clearly. We may know better what point our own decade has reached.

It is convenient to begin with Goethe. There is not space to consider his predecessors or to outline all of his purposes and problems. For us one interest of his is paramount—the theme of a man finding himself. He gave it splendid treatment in his *Faust* and in his prose fiction about Wilhelm Meister. Since his day, it has been a persistent metaphysic for European literature, and examples occur in the work of Tolstoy, Balzac, Thackeray, George Eliot, Carlyle, Wassermann, Rolland, and Romaine.

If we are to accept the Delphic instruction in which Socrates trusted, we must know ourselves, find ourselves. In doing so, we learn about ourselves in relation to all that lies about us. In the ensuing process of adjustment, we discover in us an element which baffles us; it will not compromise. It is what is called demonic in nature; it is peculiarly ours, it cannot be changed or violated; it is as permanent and indestructible as the nature of things itself. This Goethe revealed in *Egmont* and *Faust*. It is apparent in the characterizations of Dos-

toevski and Nietzsche. It has to be obeyed no matter what. It is as categorical as Socrates's *δαμόνων*. Yet the nature of a man requires that he submit to the nature of things. However active he is, he must accept the consequences of his individual behavior and the concomitant inflexibility of the nature of things about him. Such acceptance constitutes, in the Goethean sense, resignation. It seems to be an adaptation of the Stoic doctrine of following Nature or of the Christian doctrine of following the divine will.

While Goethe was solving his experience of life in this way, the philosopher Kant was trying to extricate thought from the blind-alley into which Hume had shown philosophy as heading. The solution that Kant devised involved a parallelism of a world of appearances, or world as we usually look at it, and a hidden and determining reality. In morality, he conceived our duty as being a compulsion derivative from the reality, or Thing-in-itself. Our duty is so to conduct ourselves that our behavior may well be universal practice, that is, a law. To this principle all must conform. Yet it is not easy always to determine what everybody should do, and it is not always pleasant to do our duty, even if there is basic comfort in being able to think that we have done so.

In military life an intelligent man is likely to encounter frequently situations in which he is tempted to question in his mind the wisdom or reasonableness of orders received. Like Heinrich von Kleist, Prussian officer and dramatist, he would wish to reconcile the two sides. Impressed with Kant's resolution of the difficulty, Kleist made in *The Prince of Homburg* a psychological study of the Prince's being forced to find himself by the Kantian principle. The Prince knew that in a battle as well at all other times a soldier, even if he is a high officer, must obey orders and not attempt any action without orders. Yet, on one occasion, he saw a good opportunity and proceeded on his own initiative. Despite his success, he was brought to trial and sentenced to death. His father, the ruling Elector, declined to interfere with justice. Various methods of delivering the Prince failed. But each

effort taught the Prince something about himself and the nature of duty. Finally, he accepted willingly the sentence imposed on him; in other words, after a harrowing education, he found his higher, inner self, which would surrender to a superior will without reservation. Only then did the Elector release him. Not the Prince's will had to prevail, but the will of the authority of the country.

Thus Goethe and Kleist agreed as to the necessity of a man's finding himself, his getting at what, for want of a better term, we call the soul. But living philosophy and literature do not stand still. Under the propulsion of these freshened views of the world in which we live, other philosophers and men of letters proceeded on the basis of their own experience to test their predecessors and to carry out their thought to various logical conclusions. They played variations on the same theme.

### III

Among these were the philosopher Hegel and the dramatist and critic Hebbel. Hegel developed a view of progress in history which has had great influence. Life tends to emphasize one phase excessively so that reaction brings about an over-emphasis on the opposite phase, and then the two for a while approach balance or equilibrium. This synthesis is in turn upset, and another contest arises, to be resolved in a similar fashion. A familiar example is the tendency of nations to attempt to co-operate for a time, till opposition accumulates and an exaggerated tendency to separation develops.

This theory of life was exemplified in historical drama by Hebbel. In *Agnes Bernauer*, a play of the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, the problem of the highest duty as we saw it in *The Prince of Homburg* is shown in another light. The Prince in Hebbel's drama has to obey the will of the state, represented by his father, and not remain in wedlock with Agnes, a lovely daughter of the middle class. The hero and heroine live too early for such intermarriage. (In fact, royalty is still unwilling to accede to a change.) And

if love is a true and natural basis for marriage, the lovers in such instances are victims of a social code that is passing too late for them.

Thus the person who would live life in a new way, in the way of tomorrow, is liable to suffer and to die. The old right has not yet yielded sufficiently to the new right. The theme repeats itself in each generation. It is difficult to bring about a reconciliation, and no reconciliation lasts.

The problem raises others. Sometimes the reconciliation is sought by individuals as closely related as man and wife. Hebbel considers this in *Herod and Mariamne*. How can the two who love each other really become united, when Herod belongs to a rougher sex and adheres to an older, somewhat barbaric attitude toward life and women, wishing to dominate his wife completely; whereas she clings to a gentler, freer, more sensitive way of looking at life, and will surrender to him only when he no longer will demand that she do so. She insists that her soul is her own.

Tragedy results whenever a man fails to revere the soul of a woman, to respect its privacy. It was to some a new view of woman, that she has a soul and a right to dispose of it freely. Hebbel again insisted upon reverence for another personality in *Gyges and his Ring*, a third subtle play which the dramatist derived from history and tradition.

Though Hebbel usually took plots from the past, he turned once to a situation sufficiently descriptive of his own day. In *Maria Magdalena*, his heroine is a girl of the lower class. She is betrayed and consequently is cast out by her father. Nevertheless she dies for him. In so doing, she awakens in him the conviction that in soul she had always been good, and that he was guilty because he had not realized the fact soon enough. The community, the play implies, was wrong in holding to a standard that would be displaced by one more in harmony with Christ's attitude toward the Magdalen.

A backward glance at these plays by Hebbel shows also that while it is difficult for a person to be true to himself and at the same time act in accord with what prevails in the com-

munity, woman is made significant in herself. Moreover, in relation to man, she leads toward a life of greater reverence for the individual soul. Hebbel points to the same truth, therefore, as Goethe did.

## IV

These forms of metaphysic lead directly to Ibsen. The resemblance that his ideas bear to them is so plain that we cannot help being astonished that Ibsen insisted that he knew little of his predecessors in literature. No doubt as producer of plays at an early age, he knew the well-made plays of the French theater, which had developed in part as a reaction to ill-motivated melodrama. He knew also the efforts toward social reform as made in the work of Augier and Dumas *fil.* If he did not know as a part of dramatic repertory some of the work of Goethe and Hebbel, he is a remarkable example of a man unconsciously embodying the latent spirit of his times.

After leaving drama based on history and saga-like material, Ibsen shifted, as his fellow Norwegian, Björnson, had done, to a criticism of contemporary society. First came *Pillars of Society* in the usual canon.

This is a popular type of play in that it seeks to expose the insincerity of prominent members of society. It follows the function of drama to expose villainy, incompetence, affectation, pretence, and hypocrisy. Aristophanes, Ben Jonson, Molière, and Shakspeare exposed charlatans; ineffective institutions; fads; quacks; would-be gentlemen, poets, and military heroes; hypocritical clergymen. So *Pillars of Society*, a well-constructed play, warned society against men of wealth.

A deeper theme is embodied in *A Doll's House*, in which a woman had to learn about the essential character of her husband, and in order to keep her own character sound, to act upon her findings concerning him and herself. Though this play may be taken as a protest in behalf of woman, it deals with a more profound conception, that a person must find out about himself and act accordingly. Only that kind of



truth sets the person free. The concern is not with society so much as with the real unit of society, the individual.

As Ibsen developed, he followed out the ramifications of this conception of duty. Ibsen assumed that within each person is an inner truth on which he must act, even if so doing involves death.

A subtle and life-like device of showing the way in which life integrates itself out of a present and a past, a past that resumes vitality in the present and contributes to conscious action, is Ibsen's retrospective treatment of the previous history of the characters. A brilliant drama of this type is *Rosmersholm*, which traces the consequences of an ambitious woman's intrigue to reform society. She wishes to employ as an instrument an aristocratic clergyman. At first ruthless in her exertion, she gradually changes through a deepening knowledge of his personality and ideals. He likewise becomes aware of his limitations and the nature of his conduct. They perceive that the wife who had been eliminated, as they thought, had really got out of the way in order to help them. Consequently they have to follow suit in order to act up to the best in them. Only so can they find themselves worthy.

Ibsen's dramas often involve this form of self-revelation and the compulsion ensuing upon such stripping back of one's nature to the core. Learning the truth about oneself is the driving force behind Hedda Gabler and the master-builder in the plays of which they are the protagonists.

Ibsen dealt with truth-seeking in other ways. Peer Gynt traveled far before he found himself. A husband learned that his wife must choose freely before she would be content—a paradoxical and poetic truth as presented in *A Lady from the Sea*. In *An Enemy of the People*, Dr. Stockman found that many in a community do not want to know whether the drinking-water is contaminated. Belonging to a new order in science, he was made a victim of the majority, which is "always wrong." In *Ghosts*, the danger of following convention instead of knowledge is enforced with regard to heredity.



Nor is the matter of seeking or acting upon the truth always simple. Great damage may be caused by an insistence upon superficial or external truth when the inner life of individuals rests upon a deeper truth. In *The Wild Duck* and in other plays Ibsen made this aspect explicit enough. At the same time he suggested by symbolism that there is an element of mystery about the inner truth by which the individual must live. The maxim, "Find yourself," whether applied to a man or to a woman, proves to be complex and not simple.

Human beings baffle society which tries to make one rule fit all. Many a person, precious to the community, cannot be moulded to a formula. Of such a nature are the wanderer, the enjoyer of life, the idealist who cannot put his ideas into practice. Ibsen and after him Galsworthy in *The Pigeon* bespoke consideration for those who decline to be ticketed by sociological organizations. Society can best survive only by allowing these folk the freedom which their nature demands, by recognizing that human life includes a demonic element which must be revered.

## v

Thus Ibsen often emphasized will-power in the search after truth, but he allowed something for ineffectiveness in the usual sense, for the categorical tendency to day-dreaming. Sometimes whole peoples or whole eras seem to be caught in a trap, caught in an inability to adapt themselves to the deepest truth they know. On such occasions we expect the dramatist to reflect his age. Granting that explanation for Chekhov as a Russian at the end of the previous century, we must acknowledge that there is more to the business than that. Chekhov with his physician's and poet's eyes viewed the yearnings, joys, and pangs of a thousand individual men and women. In his prose fiction and in his plays, for example, *The Cherry Orchard*, a sense for the beauty of life makes even more poignant to us the recurrent sense of the futility of exercising the will. Over and over we are unable to adapt ourselves quite to the persons dearest to us, or to act by the deepest truth that we have come to know.

At times, therefore, we tend to lodge our minds in a past that seems in many respects to have been more free and successful. In that past in itself, there is less of an atmosphere of disillusionment. Memories of music, of the odors and colors of flowers, of gestures of human loveliness and affection become the real world for the individual. The event survives in a beauty that surpasses even anticipation; and the memory of anticipation is an inestimable possession.

If this is a characteristic of Chekhov, it becomes dominant in Proust's *À la Recherche du temps perdu*. The past prevails over the present. It can not only revive and determine the present, as in Ibsen and in the Dutch novelist of the *Small Souls*, Couperus, but efface the present, completely eclipse it as if there were no demarcation between past and present. We extract the essence of ourselves through remembrance. We live in order to evoke former days, to distill the spirit of previous experience. And thus we realize ourselves, not by trying to fulfill our duty but by enriching our memories.

This view of life does not mean a lack of discipline. It came of an unflinching facing of experience, of a desire to attain to the elusive truth of life. The product has no small admixture of the bitter and the painful.

A glance back at this stage in our survey of the pattern of thought previous to Pirandello makes us begin to suspect that though there may be a *truth of life*, perhaps we can reach only *truths of life*.

Comparing the truths discerned by these writers with one another and with our own experience tends to lead us to the conclusion that while in each case truth has been found, truth still lies beyond. Is it possible that no complete catalog can be made?

## VI

There is the mocking possibility that a figment may be more real than an actual person. So Anatole France in *Crainquebille* relates how at one time all embarrassments in the household of M. Bergeret were conveniently laid at the

door of a putative gardener, Putois. In his humor and skeptical dialectic, in his freedom with the form in which he offers the results of his quest after truth, France is comparable to Pirandello. His devices are, to be sure, different. He blurs distinction between men, angels, penguins; saints and sinners, clergy and laity. He creates an Abbé Coignard to establish the paradoxical nature of being really alive. He finds desire or anticipation more to be lived for than consummation and less illusory, so that the unrealized project is more real than the act or so-called fulfillment. Thus in childhood there is a poetic charm which ironically is closer to truth than maturity.

## VII

Anatole France's frankness is far from that professed by contemporary advocates of naturalism, a movement that affected both drama and prose fiction. Though naturalism may be deemed to be a form of realism, it is committed to a metaphysic based on scientific method. It assumes that an author can be rigorously impersonal and quite without feeling as regards his characters and their fate. He merely records a large number of observations about them as he might do for plants, animals, or physical phenomena. The hypothesis is that no man can choose his fate or improve his lot. Each person is a victim of heredity and environment. Zola was the spokesman for the movement in France, Hauptmann the leader in German drama. Yet both authors, curiously enough, wished to better the lives of individuals and of classes. Though they would not recognize that an individual can improve his circumstances, they held implicitly that society or the group can effect a change. It is difficult to understand how a group of individuals can bring about that to which no individual in the group can contribute his mite of aid. Yet this is a familiar and creditable if vain aspiration on the part of naturalistic and behavioristic thought.

A further characteristic is that the greater men of letters in the movement were not content with naturalistic truth. The formula left out poetic truth, and their candor precluded

their evasion of that element in life. *Poetic* is not a sufficiently inclusive term to define what had been overlooked; personal idealism and music also suggest what had been omitted. Zola turned to a subtler consideration of idealism in the priesthood; Hauptmann depicted the creative soul in his poetic drama, *The Sunken Bell*. Strindberg became less absorbed in denouncing the tyranny of sex or woman in nature, and as a result of further spiritual experience of his own, began to explore life of the individual soul. He found that music would assist in communicating what he came upon now. Phases of the past recur to the mind like haunting melodies; life hovers uncertainly between a sort of everyday world and a dream, as in plays by Calderon and Grillparzer. The vibrations of the personality, its compositions in suite or sonata form, become the material for such plays as *The Dream Play*, *After the Fire*, *Easter*, *Crimes*, *The Thunderstorm*, and *The Spook Sonata*. Music assists, but is not so dominant as in Wagner.

Strindberg in this respect suggests Maeterlinck. The Belgian dramatist and essayist never quite accepted naturalism, though in some of his plays his characters behaved like marionettes of doom and moved only with strings manipulated by fate. But this fate, perceptible to intuition, permitted the individual, the innermost soul, which can never be touched by wrong, to divine vaguely at least oncoming disaster. The playwright found no advantage in making life appear sordid, and granted the presence of beauty, however tinged with sadness. Such practice is again opposed to the usual conduct of naturalism. Maeterlinck, like Strindberg, would employ devices other than pantomime and dialogue to bring out the truth. Thus in *The Blue Bird* he provided not only the spectacle of flowers but filled the theater with their fragrance. It is appropriate therefore that the line of spiritual thought in *Pelléas and Mélisande* should irradiate various iridescent flashes of emotion, and that, better even than the play, should be the opera wherein Debussy supplied the music that would round out the expression of the inner meaning.

These sallies of beauty accompanying the line of exper-

ience of a soul or a personality remind one of Pirandello's tendency to make each sally of the experience of a personality a personality in itself. Each flash is a spark of electricity in a succession of sparks which we commonly think of as an individual, whereas it may be that each spark is a totality of energy and experience.

## VIII

But a review of the writers thus far considered might lead to the conclusion that by one way or another it is possible to get at some sort of truth about the personality, to intimate some bit of definiteness about the individual and his neighbors. On the one hand, a man can strive intensely to get at himself and his innermost duty. On the other hand, he may admit the demonic, the uncontrollable fixity in him which contributes likewise to his destiny. Thus we may say that Conrad in *The Nigger of the Narcissus* treated an essentially demonic personality, one that is itself and that belongs to nobody else. At the same time it is uncertain as to how far Wait is an imposter, a malingerer, or as to what part of him is unreal and what is sincere. Something in him is real if we may judge from the effects.

Without considering all the ways in which Conrad puzzled over the nature of human beings, we may linger over his implication that no one can learn about the real nature of his soul. Herein he approached the manner of Henry James when the latter, as in *The Ambassadors*, watched over Strether who was trying to find out the bearing of his ideals, as by stages he uncovered the truth about himself and others. Conrad, however, without disesteem for such intentions on the part of an individual, felt skeptical of James's postulate that the hero was achieving his goal. In *Lord Jim*, for example, the hero underwent at sea an initial experience on account of which it might be deemed that he had demonstrated himself guilty of cowardice. With an ordinary writer such a situation might have led to the depiction of the man's attempts to vindicate himself before society. But society may be too willing to

readmit a man as courageous on the performance of daring acts. Consequently society is an incompetent court, not qualified to judge about the inner truth. Only the man himself can perform that office. Thus Conrad traced a man's quest to learn whether he is a coward. Experiences that ordinarily would suffice are rejected by the man as inadequate tests. In fact no trial enables him to be convinced. Death itself, faced unflinchingly and fatally, is an ambiguous termination to such a man's search after the truth about his own nature. No answer comes to the person most concerned. Must it be said, therefore, that the only truth about such a man is that which others surmise in him? And is it quite satisfactory to rely on their judgment?

## IX

And thus we come to Pirandello. In the pattern of thought which we have been examining where does he fit? What corollary could he add to the search for truth about the individual?

In a thousand ways he insists that the quest of our own personalities is baffling, if not fruitless, because as we strip off our outer selves in order to reach a core upon which we may create our structure in the world, we can keep on stripping as if we were removing the skin of an onion. In the end there is no core. Which layer, then, is really we? Up to the very last whatever is left is we, and after that nothing.

This metaphysical problem as to what constitutes the individual is illustrated by Pirandello in a number of odd situations. A most famous instance occurs in the novel, *The Late Mattia Pascal* (1904). In this the hero finds it necessary to accept while still alive the decision of the community and of the law that he is dead. He has to provide himself with a new personality with a new past. With almost conscious ingenuity the world contrives situations which test Mattia's powers of invention regarding his past. The invented past has to become real, for it is the only possible past for him, and it determines his behavior in the present.



The treatment is humorous. A moment's reflection shows that the hypothesis is not so preposterous as at first it might have seemed to be. Many a person has to manufacture a new past for one reason or another, many a person would like to do so. There are uncomfortable experiences, not always of guilt, which one shrinks to recall; the first time and the last, it is to be hoped, that a boy, feeling his strength, half-chokes another boy till he unexpectedly sees his eyes bulge and his color change; the time when a boy, irritated, approaches another boy whose knees begin to knock and cheeks and lips to tremble, and the aggressor learns something about the other and about himself that he wishes he had never known. How well the boy would like to deny that such acts spring from his own personality and to be sure that only a false exterior of his playmate betrayed an inner, courageous self.

What many might wish would happen to them happens to Pascal. Which was the real personality of Mattia?

Pirandello gives the problem a tragic and ironic turn in a play which came later, *Henry IV*. One of a group, while going to a masquerade as the medieval monarch, is injured and for a while after partial recovery thinks himself really to be Henry IV, and is humored in the conception. Subsequently he recovers fully, but on perceiving certain sinister advantages in persisting in the quasi-lunacy, decides to continue his life as Henry IV, his acquired personality. Which phase is the real man?

A somewhat esoteric treatment of the same metaphysic is afforded by a play that has become popular, *Six Characters in Search of an Author*. This appeals especially to writers, critics, and others more or less professionally interested in the composition and production of plays as related to life. Of a wider appeal because less professional is *As You Desire Me*, which with different endings was much admired on the stage and in motion pictures. The head of an aristocratic family is distracted because his wife had disappeared during the Great War. A friend of his purports to have found her living as mistress of a writer in Italy and unable to recall her



life at home. With difficulty she is persuaded to return to the chateau and to resume refined ways of living. We are uncertain whether she is the wife afflicted with amnesia or an imposter coached to fill perfectly the shoes and personality of the missing wife. She has to undergo tests such as being recognized by old family servants, matching even to the color of her eyes a portrait of the wife painted with poetic interpretation before the war, and being greeted by a dog. With either ending to the play, we are puzzled as to which personality is the real one, or are they all real?

In another play, *And Ye Clothed Me (or Naked)*, the subtlety of Pirandello is his skill in weaving back and forth across a line between the pathetic and the comic, without strong deviation to either side. The plot concerns the character of Ersilia Drei and an event, possibly murder, which had taken place in Smyrna. As in Ibsen, the past is revived to affect the present, but it is difficult to determine what the past was, what the motives were. The trouble is not with the dramatist but with the characters involved and their memories. The survivors do not agree with one another or with the explanations they had given previously. The more they seem to strip their characters to the truth, the more uncertain do we become as to which part is the truth. The personalities appear to change from hour to hour, and accordingly the memories and the attitude toward them shift too.

In this way the individual personality is not only chameleon-like in its change of external appearances but protean in the core—if there is any core—and never assuming the same form more than once. Or personality is like sunlight on spray. If we see the drops of water at one angle, we observe no color; whereas another person, standing at a different angle, watches iridescence at play with the moving particles. The same water and superficially at least the same illumination contribute to different results. Which is the true effect, the essence of water at motion in sunlight? Are the colors after all in us? Even externally in the wavering light, the rainbow seems impalpable, immaterial. Without the com-

municating vibrations of the medium between the drops and the eyes, there would be no color; and equally necessary is the converting power of our sensory organs and nervous system bringing numberless images to our minds. The fleeting iris is no property of the water alone. Thus by analogy we have no personality of our own, but exist only in others. And like the rainbow which persists though the water has changed with each fraction of the passing of time, our personality, superficially the same, has altered likewise, and we are no longer we. From this standpoint Pirandello reduces us to impermanent vibrations or potentialities of vibration.

Though there is beauty in such a conception of our being and no doubt a variety, there is something disquieting in finding all people, including ourselves, in the state of flux. We are inclined to take less seriously any injunction to find ourselves or to find what is the larger and higher will to which we should conform. Yet in a philosophic sense the difficulty is not a new one, for it was recognized in substance long ago. From this point of view, moreover, we can accept that sort of certainty or fixed character of existence wherein all is subject to change. Thus we fall back upon the paradox of Heraclitus, that everything flows or is in motion, and yet the sun himself dares not disobey the fixed law of his motion.

To class Pirandello's metaphysic with relativity would be pseudo-science. Nor is the view cynical or pessimistic, even if it seems to face a blind-alley. Such situations appear inevitable when a train of thought is thoroughly developed. And there is something satisfying in the integrity which has such candor.

Nor is the failure of each of us to possess an obviously static personality an unmitigated disaster. Pirandello, as he declared after the Great War, views the scene of life with fear and pity, only too conscious of its irony. It is an advantage to know the truth which he has perceived about us, as well as the truths which were discerned by his predecessors in philosophy and literature. We may even infer that their truths, like ours, were priceless fruit of their experience.

Furthermore we may become more genuinely tolerant of other folk, more humble, less certain that any man is qualified to judge others, less sure that one rule covers all or even a majority of cases.

## X

It may be asked whether this metaphysic of Pirandello affects adversely the form of treatment. With respect to prose fiction there is little difficulty. But for an average American audience, a difficulty tends to arise from its experience with conventions of motivation. One may wonder what security there can be for understanding the dramatic situation if the personality of each character changes constantly and hence its motives shift. Ordinarily a character is supposed to be consistent. But in practice no hardship is encountered provided that the spectator realizes the fundamental premise. He can adapt himself to almost any subtlety if he is given the key—fairy-stories, operas, musical comedies, or with another approach, plays in which characters grow, as in *Macbeth* and *Rosmersholm*.

It may be added that audiences behave with Pirandellian unpredictability.

## XI

Pirandello's art is a mature, not a sophisticated, art. It deals repeatedly with the experiences of mature men and women. The material which he handles is not intended mainly for the young, as some people think that all art should be. I do not refer to his use of irregularities in marital life, for that is common enough stuff in drama and prose fiction, but to the inner life of maturity. In that life—behind a masque if you will—the individual examines his own motives and looks for signs by which he may surmise the inner life of others—behind their masques—and guess what sort of person each of the others thinks him to be.

When a person who is frustrated (and what person is not sooner or later?) looks about and finds others succeeding, he is liable to speculate as to what may be wrong with him that he

too does not succeed. Perhaps he is living in an environment which opposes most of his desires because it believes them to be abnormal, erratic, idealistic, or unproductive of money and position. If so, he may come to wonder which is abnormal, he or the community. He would perhaps like to feel at home, but the others may emphasize the lack of common ground and intimate that he is crazy. If the situation is that of a reformer—Ibsen's Dr. Stockman, for example—it is clear to any audience. But if the affair is less nearly allied to sensation or propaganda, if it is close to ordinary life, it is somewhat less likely to be apparent to the immature theater-goer. Only those who analyze their own experiences are prepared to admit how common are the situations that Pirandello employs the stage to illustrate. He clarifies the matter for the audience by including characters that comment on their own experiences and derive what may be called a metaphysic from them. They make their explanations on the basis of concrete data and not of academic abstractions. The substance is life, mature life.

This fact is fundamental to the method of Pirandello. He starts likewise with the concrete, the experiences which may have meaning or shed light upon what puzzles us. But since no one experience is a complete revelation, the active mind is avid of further experiences, and unceasingly hopes to progress in knowing "what it is all about." From this standpoint, Pirandello is scarcely a philosopher. As a poet, an artist, he watches life within and without, and records it as it seems to him. His view of life is unprofessional, however discerning. It approaches that of a mature, observant, intelligent, frank man in the streets of life. In a popular sense, it is a philosophy.

## SOME EARLY DISCUSSIONS OF THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

EDGAR W. KNIGHT

"I MUST in all honesty say, that, looking back through the years, and recalling the requirements and methods of the ancient institution, I am unable to speak of it with all the respect I could wish. Such training as I got, useful for the struggle of life, I got after, instead of before graduation, and it came hard; while I never have been able—and now, no matter how long I may live, I never shall be able—to overcome some great disadvantages which the superstitions and wrong theories and worse practices of my Alma Mater inflicted upon me. And not on me alone. The same may be said of my contemporaries, as I have observed them in success and failure. What was true in this respect of the college of thirty years ago is, I apprehend, at least partially true of the college of today; and it is true not only of Cambridge, but of other colleges, and of them quite as much as of Cambridge. They fail properly to fit their graduates for the work they have to do in the life that awaits them."

Thus was Harvard criticized by Charles Francis Adams, Jr., in an address called "A College Fetish," which he gave before the Harvard Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in 1883, three decades after he had been graduated by that distinguished institution. A century earlier another distinguished son of Harvard (Harrison Gray Otis) had charged that his Alma Mater was oppressed by traditional and fixed academic customs. In 1782 he said: "May Father Time ameliorate his pace and hasten the desired period when I shall bid adieu to the sophisticated Jargon of a superstitious synod of pensioned bigots."

In these two bitter criticisms is revealed the supremacy of ancient higher educational ideals that had been inherited from the early colonial colleges and had persisted through the

eighteenth and far into the nineteenth century. The substance of the college curriculum far after the Civil War rested upon old foundations and a historic model whose roots reached back into the dim past. Higher education was firmly fixed in the grip of a stubborn tradition that was to become and remain for many decades the center of violent scholastic struggles, conflicts between the traditional subjects on the one hand and modern subjects on the other. Nearly two and a half centuries were to pass after the founding of Harvard before serious attention was to be given by the colleges and universities of this country to the facts of the material universe and the science of human society. Meantime, college students continued to be immersed in ancient linguistics, vague theories, and dogmas that bore little relation to their life. Opportunities for vital education were probably little richer here than in England in the eighteenth and a large part of the nineteenth century.

But the history of the collegiate curriculum of the United States shows it definitely as a growth and not as an accident. From the curriculum of Henry Dunster, who brought it from Cambridge in 1640, from the earliest to the latest record of the course of study, there is this evidence of growth, although fundamental changes did not take place in the curriculum until after 1860. The story of this part of the American college, over which conflicts have so often waged, also shows that as time passes and conditions change the demands upon the college curriculum increase. In the main, this story divides itself into three rather definite periods: from the beginnings to about 1860; between that date and the World War; and since the World War.

The first of these periods was marked by the well-known domination of the classics in a fixed curriculum of a few other subjects that included mathematics, rhetoric, logic, and moral philosophy—the seventeenth, eighteenth, and a part of the nineteenth-century version of the ancient *trivium* and *quadrivium*, the “seven liberal arts,” which formed the curriculum of the medieval universities. These subjects were standard



in most of the colleges; slight differences here and there only served to give emphasis to the similarity of the American college curriculum for two centuries or more. Generally, also, these subjects had become ends in themselves. Completion of them was required because of their alleged cultural values and the dignity they were supposed to bestow upon the students who kept the faith and finished the course. Occasional efforts at departures from the traditional curriculum were made, as at Philadelphia under the influence of Franklin about the middle of the eighteenth century, at William and Mary about 1779, by suggestion of Governor Thomas Jefferson, and at the University of Virginia, in 1826, under the influence of Jefferson. But prophets of new ideals in collegiate curriculum were not numerous in the United States until far into the nineteenth century.

The second period in the development in the college curriculum of the United States may be said to have begun after the Civil War. If a date must be fixed the most nearly accurate one would probably be 1869, when Charles W. Eliot began his distinguished career of forty years as president of Harvard. From that time until about 1914 the tendency was definitely away from a fixed curriculum toward gradually increasing freedom of elective programs, under the assumption, which some thoughtful people believed to be a bit violent, that the college student was sufficiently mature to make wise selections of his courses. The classics now began to yield, and numerous new subjects were given places in the curriculum.

The elective system gained wide vogue under the influence of Harvard, which was the leading university of the land and therefore identified with the fitness of things. By 1885 Eliot was able to say of that institution: "No required subjects now remain except the writing of English, the elements of either French or German, and a few lectures on Chemistry and Physics." His address on "Liberty in Education" presented the arguments for the elective system.

No consideration of the change in the curriculum during this period, however, can neglect the significance of the secular



upheaval in its administration following the advent of the "Gilded Age," when the colleges and universities appeared to begin to pay "less and less attention to the thunders of the pulpit." Great business leaders were being appealed to for educational endowments, and by 1900 the lists of trustees of colleges and universities "read like a corporation directory." This change from ecclesiastical control to lay control of higher education had direct effect upon the heritage of the old classical tradition which had come down from the theologians and had held sway since colonial days. The classics which for centuries had been bent mainly toward theological purposes began to wane, and religion began to have a smaller place in the program of higher educational study. This dissolving process was hastened also by the growth of the natural sciences as subjects of instruction in the colleges and universities. Changes in the curriculum now began to point definitely toward business and the secular professions. Meantime, Eliot was reorganizing Harvard and, apparently with the manner of a business "efficiency" expert, was sweeping the place clean of "most of the old-fashioned teachers whose minds and methods belonged to the eighteenth century." As already noted, the classical prescriptions for the Harvard degree were radically altered. Henry Cabot Lodge remarked on the change that under the old plan "a certain amount of knowledge, no more useless than any other, and a still larger amount of discipline in learning were forced on all alike. Under the new system it was possible to escape without learning anything at all by a judicious selection of unrelated subjects taken up only because they were easy or because the burden imposed by those who taught them was light." Whatever the criticism—and it increased during the next few decades—the widened elective curriculum offered to those students who were really interested in learning richer opportunities than they had ever before known and in fields which the old curriculum had closed to most of the earlier generations of college students. The sciences, for example, were now given a place which had formerly been occupied only by the ancient

languages. Art, music, letters, and the social studies came into the curriculum of higher education even if they sometimes had to creep in through the back door.

The third period, which roughly covers the past two decades, has been marked by a strong swing away from freedom of election to a measure of prescription by the faculty, a change that appears to have come about as a result of several influences. Before the World War began, chaos was threatening to reign under the rampant elective system, many of whose romantic promises were unfulfilled. Meantime, there was a growing belief among many educators who were agonizing with the problem that the college students of this country needed acquaintance with "a common intellectual world" and opportunity to develop more social intelligence. This recent tendency in the curriculum, therefore, took the form of experiments with required or elective orientation, general, or overview courses in the social and the natural sciences, and of the establishment of group requirements, major and minor sequences, fields of concentration, and specialized curricula. There has been increasing effort also to guide students without hampering them and to adjust the work of the college to their needs, interests, and abilities. This change has been due in part to the changed student personnel (the colleges now have many students who were not the well-instructed students whom Harvard had in Eliot's day), to the new necessity brought about by an increasingly complex world, to the influence of the fact of individual differences, and to the growing need for educational guidance. Psychology, for example, has given to educational workers instruments for knowing students better, and social developments have brought about a need for the integration of knowledge. Modifications during the past two decades do not indicate that the elective system has been abandoned but rather that the principle of election has been adapted, through the means of increased knowledge of the educative process and of the human material with which the colleges work, to changed conditions. These changes have been made, as changes in the college curriculum have

always been made, after much contest against the "momentum of inertia," against open opposition, and the doubts and fears of vested academic interests and departmental aspirations or ambitions.

The emphasis in the first period is too well known to be discussed at length here. Most of the educational writings, particularly of college presidents, concerned the importance of the classics and their place in the curriculum. The doctrine of mental discipline was as fashionable in education as was that of original sin in theology. The high veneration for the traditional curriculum and particularly for the classics may be seen in the founding of Alleghany College in a frontier town of 700 people in Pennsylvania in 1817. Encased in the corner stone were a chip of Plymouth Rock, some mortar from what was said to be the tomb of Virgil, and a piece of marble from Dido's temple. And at this institution's first commencement a citizen of the village gave an address in Latin to which the president of the college responded in the same language. Other features of the exercises included an oration in Latin, an oration in Hebrew, and a dialogue in Latin, which "proclaimed the intellectual kinship of the new community with the older centers of learning" and showed Alleghany's constituents that the new college spoke the cultured language of Harvard and Yale and therefore deserved support. The contents of the corner stone of Alleghany symbolized educational ideals which were paramount in the colleges of this country until after the middle of the nineteenth century. Moreover, the religious and political philosophy that emerged in New England was a powerful influence in determining college work from one end of the land to the other during the period under discussion.

Between 1779, when Jefferson proposed a liberal plan of education for Virginia, and the time when Charles W. Eliot began to change things at Harvard, the growth of the ideal of a liberal college curriculum was slow. In practice the traditional program generally continued to be followed for many years. In 1842 Francis Wayland said, in his "On the Present

College System," that "the Northern Colleges are so nearly similar that students, in good standing in one institution, find little difficulty in being admitted to any other." Mental discipline was the chief purpose of the college, and any effort to alter this was not looked upon with favor.

The charge of the stubbornness of tradition in higher education is amply confirmed by the literature of the period under discussion. The theory of higher education that had so long prevailed, and prevails even now in some quarters, seemed to maintain that through it minds should be formed by one pattern and human characters fashioned in a uniform mold. Most of those who were responsible for the direction of higher education seemed to see beauty and completeness in the curriculum. To them there was little or no opportunity to improve its effectiveness. It was defended eloquently and emphatically, and criticism of it was resented. The college curriculum was a definite thing, and the required subjects were believed to furnish the best discipline of minds and to be indispensable to liberally educated men. A report of a committee appointed at a meeting of the president and fellows of Yale College, September 11, 1827, which seems to have been intended for the governing board of that college, emphasized discipline as the basis of higher education.

But other ideals than the conservative were beginning to take form in this country more than a hundred years ago. The faculty of Amherst College made two reports to the Board of Trustees of that institution about 1827 which stated that the idea of college reform was a "popular question" even in those days. The report also stated that the American public was not "satisfied with the present course of education in our higher seminaries" and that the course was "not sufficiently modern and comprehensive to meet the exigencies of the age and country in which we live." The popular voice was not hostile alone to the ancient languages, but there appeared to be a growing belief that the colleges should open their doors more widely to those young people who would not go into the learned professions but whom the colleges could

help. "The complaint is, and if our ears do not deceive us, it daily waxes louder and louder, that while everything else is on the advance, our colleges are stationary; or, if not quite stationary that they are in danger of being left far behind, in the rapid march of improvement."

This is one of the earliest of the progressive notes struck by a college faculty in the literature dealing with the curriculum of higher education in the United States. Complaints were being made "by men whose strong good sense, education and standing in society entitled them to be heard." It was also argued that, these people would likely contend that in times of progress and in a country like this, "It is absurd to cling so tenaciously to the prescriptive forms of other centuries"; it was ridiculous to meet demands for improvement "without cry of innovation." Here as in most of the quarrels about the college curriculum in most of the nineteenth century in the United States the contest was largely over the monopoly of the ancient classics. It is interesting to note also that in this report of the Amherst faculty arguments were made for the establishment of a department of "The Science of Education."

In 1867 Cornell set forth some educational ideals which were not unlike those published at Amherst forty years earlier, and promised that "every effort will be made that the education given be practically useful." There was to be no fetichism in regard to subjects of study. "All good studies will be allowed their due worth." An effort was to be made to give every student studies which would take a "practical hold on the tastes, aspirations and work of his life." There was to be no "petty daily marking system, a pedantic device which has eaten out from so many colleges all capacity among students to seek knowledge for knowledge's sake. Those professors will be sought who can stir enthusiasm, and who can thus cause students to do far more than under a perfunctory piecemeal study." The plan adopted by the Board of Trustees of Cornell also called for "a closer and more manly intercourse

and sympathy between Faculty and students than is usual in most of the colleges."

Other leaders occasionally expressed liberal views. Jasper Adams of Hobart College, who went to South Carolina in 1824 and undertook to put life into the College of Charleston, while a conservative in education, was not inhospitable to suggestions for improvement. Jonathan Maxcy, who preceded Thomas Cooper at the University of South Carolina, introduced French into the curriculum of that institution and as early as 1811 was interested in putting science into the course of study. Courses were arranged for those students who did not wish to take Greek or Latin, and a chair of political economy was established. The interest of Thomas Cooper in the natural and the social sciences is well known, and his lectures on geology and political economy were distinguished for their stimulation. Joseph LeConte and some other progressive members of the faculty of the University of Georgia planned some reforms in 1859, but the Civil War kept the proposed measures from being put into operation. Horace Holley of the University of Transylvania in Kentucky maintained that education should be adjusted to changing conditions, "much more with a regard for the present, and a prospect for the future, than from a retrospect and remembrance of antecedent times." Philip Lindsley of the University of Nashville had a progressive view of education, and sought to make use of a plan similar to that in operation at the University of Virginia. Henry P. Tappan of Michigan would give students freedom of choice and stimulate them not by authority but by developing their natural interests. He advocated self-direction and not compulsion. F. A. P. Barnard, who went from a professorship and later the presidency of the University of Alabama to the presidency of the University of Mississippi and then to the presidency of Columbia, changed his views on higher education and apparently became more and more progressive. While in Alabama he was an avowed conservative, but in Mississippi he had a slight change of heart as he faced actual conditions and needs in that State,



and at Columbia, where he became president in 1866, he became even more liberal. There he maintained that the classics as taught in the colleges were "not a stimulus but a sedative." When Joseph Caldwell came from Princeton to Chapel Hill he found a rather liberal curriculum in the University of North Carolina, with an unusual amount of science, history, and political economy and provision for electives, but he gradually substituted the traditional curriculum, and North Carolina soon returned to the classical fold, where the institution remained until the Civil War and for some years afterwards.

College presidents and faculties in the first period here discussed should not be too severely censured for failure to study the curriculum, which was fixed, unchanging, and sacrosanct. Any alteration of it would have been profanation. Moreover, even if it had seemed wise to change the program of study, it probably could not have been done, because the energies of the faculty were so absorbed in making and enforcing rules of conduct among the students that they had no time to employ in curriculum reconstruction. The early American college was a patriarchal institution, and the life of the student was not unlike that of a soldier in barracks. His existence for the twenty hours was regimented, and each hour was covered by a rule.

The laws of Union College in the early part of the nineteenth century contained eleven chapters running from seven to twenty-three sections each. President Eliphalet Nott, who showed a liberal tendency on questions of curriculum, said that perhaps no college had ever provided so complete security as Union for "the manners and morals of youth, or a course more likely to ensure a thorough education." The rules at the University of Georgia consisted of sixteen pages. Princeton students were covered with rules, one of which required them to raise their hats to the president at a distance of ten rods. Students at Transylvania could not lean on each other in class. James Russell Lowell was forced into "rustication" for two months in his senior year at Harvard and compelled to read John Locke and other difficult authors during the



period. A visitor at the commencement at Yale in 1847 was shocked to see so many members of the graduating class wantonly break "the glass in their rooms. Very dignified and honorable beginning of the world for them." President Samuel Smith is said to have expelled 125 of the 200 students at Princeton in 1807, following a riot, which was far from the last trouble in that Presbyterian stronghold. President Hale of Hobart "was kept at bay by a shower of beer-bottles" and at another time was forced to climb through a window and down a ladder to escape trouble from students in his classroom. At Chapel Hill the students "rode horses through the dormitory and 'shot up' the place generally"; at Charlottesville a student shot and killed a professor in 1842; and President Jeremiah Chamberlain of Oakland College in Mississippi came to his death at the stabbing hand of a drunken student.

Francis Wayland's first job at Brown "was to frame a new set of laws for the college. . . . It made a vastly greater amount of labor necessary for both officers and students." The president of Miami in Ohio prayed in Chapel "with one eye open." When he saw a trouble-maker he would dart off the platform, attend properly to the offender, and then return to his post and resume his prayer. In most of the colleges there were long lists of merits and demerits and systems of fines for offenses. Discipline was made more difficult, too, because parents were more troublesome in those days; and in some of the smaller colleges a few students and a few "tuition fees might be the margin of financial solvency." Indulgent parents of wealth and "the alleged laziness of Southern youth" were pointed out by Basil Manly as two afflictions of his administration as president of the University of Alabama; and Phillip Lindsley told a commencement audience at the University of Nashville in 1848 that the interference by parents in his efforts at the discipline of students was one of his gravest difficulties.irate parents caused much trouble when their son was not promoted, or got into trouble, or was sent home. The impatient presi-

dent states the case this way: "The son is a high-minded, honorable, brave, generous, good-hearted young gentleman; who scorns all subterfuge and meanness, and who would not lie for the universe! Not he. In this particular at least, he is above suspicion; and, like the Pope, is infallible. While the Faculty are a parcel of paltry pedants, pedagogues, bigots, charlatans—without feeling, spirit, kindness, honesty, or common sense." President Nisbet of Dickinson College often complained of interference by the trustees; and Andrew D. White gave the same condition as the basis of "the anarchy at Hobart"; the expulsion of wealthy boys meant a loss of revenue for the college and such a loss was difficult to take. It should be noted, in defense of such extra-curricular activities, that mischief-making was about the only outlet for college youth who bore in the old days such a burden of original sin.

In the same year that Cornell made its announcement, John Fishe, writing in the *Atlantic Monthly*, said that many of the colleges needed minor reforms. He thought that even Harvard could stand a little improvement. But reform was one thing; revolution was another. So he warned against sweeping changes. He favored a degree of the elective system and argued for "comprehensive" examinations to include fields of knowledge rather than particular subjects. A closer and more friendly relation between the students and the faculty was necessary if the colleges were to become truly democratic and liberal. The *Atlantic Monthly* for September, 1866, contained an article, the substance of an address to the alumni of Harvard University, which attacked the prevailing system of college marks and compulsory tasks. It argued for a reduction of the college course to three years and urged that the freshman year be made a probationary period. The interests and needs of the individual student were subjugated to traditional academic forms and procedures; the first duty of the college was to offer students broad opportunities and inspiration.

A writer in *Education* for July, 1882, urged a division of

the college period, the first two years for a general foundation and the last two years for concentration in a chosen field. Such a plan would afford the student a more nearly complete and generous education and at the same time provide him with the best disciplinary values. Improvement in the organization and instruction of the colleges would mean improvement of the work in the lower schools. All studies should be "integrated" with actual life needs, he said, and, whatever reorganizations were undertaken, only the best teachers should be engaged. "The essential test of a school system is to be looked for in the quality of its teachers."

A writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* the following year deplored the multiplicity of college studies and the elective system and proposed in place of the chaotic curriculum of the time the principle of general courses in the social and biological sciences not unlike the orientation or overview courses such as have found their way into some higher educational institutions in recent years. Such courses, he said, would give a good foundation for life and for further study in specialized fields. The college must fit men for living in the actual world of men, he insisted.

A writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* for August, 1885, insisted that among the fallacies then present in the educational thought of the country were the elective system, preoccupation with practical considerations, and the insistence upon education for the "struggle of life." The same year Andrew F. West employed the *North American Review* to assail President Eliot's elective system as unsound in theory and to assert that all educational experience taught that the ancient classics and mathematics were the foundations of mental training. He said that the elective system struck at the heart of what collegiate prestige the United States had built for itself, by lowering entrance requirements, by destroying the meaning of the academic degree, and by encouraging students to forsake those twin roots of culture: Greek and Latin. The monster was feeding upon the vitals of education and should be resisted and dispatched. On the other hand, the breezy

Godkin of the *Nation* (November, 1885) saw hope in the modern attitude of Harvard, which offered a student 189 courses in twenty departments. He believed the college was becoming modernized and liberal and that this changed condition was due to the substitution of lay control for ecclesiastical control in its management. A few months earlier the same publication editorially deplored the position of college professors in this country. They were at the mercy of the boards of trustees who were generally business men, usually ignorant, uncultured, money-grabbing people who cared not a whit for the actual educational work of the colleges but only for filling the institutions with tuition-payers. The editor believed that the professors could manage better.

*Education* conducted in June, 1900, a symposium on "The Problems which Confront our Colleges at the Opening of the Twentieth Century," in which a number of distinguished university presidents participated. Among the pressing problems listed were the elective system, personal freedom of students, the controversy of the classics, interests of students in merely earning degrees, the tendency toward specialization, the lack of interest of students in politics and government, the failure of the colleges to imbue students with public spirit, the need for the integration of the cultural and the disciplinary values in the college curriculum, the loss of simplicity in college education, the growing complexity of administration, the predominance of athletics, the apparent failure of the colleges to integrate their programs with actual life, and the danger that the colleges would unwittingly blunder into or be led to by placing emphasis upon crass materialism. It is distressing to learn that this affliction of higher education in recent years and even since 1929 should have appeared impending more than three decades ago.

By the turn of the century the subject of higher education had a more prominent place in magazines and newspapers than it had ever before held in such publications, and between 1900 and the close of the World War there was wider discussion of higher education in the United States than this country had

ever witnessed. While the increased number of students attending colleges and universities was regarded as a good sign in 1900, a slight uneasiness was felt here and there because of the apparent tendency to create a group of scholars who could not do "the common work of the world." A writer in *World's Work* for that year noted that "men of fortune endow schools which train youth who win success and in turn endow schools to train other youth," presumably to win success. The same publication the same year asked whether education was "the great panacea for social ills that our fathers thought it." Dr. Butler's *Education in the United States*, which gave an excellent summary of education in this country in 1900, sought to refute the idea or notion that education caused crime, a subject that led a colleague of his three decades later to argue that the kind of education given in the United States had caused or appeared to have caused crime. An editorial in a prominent magazine in June, 1900, praised the general trend of education but criticized some of its practices, such as the elective system, the growing demand for Ph.D.'s in the colleges, and the lack of contact between teacher and student. *Scribner's* deplored the tendency toward "Teutonizing in Education," while a writer in *Education* urged the colleges to train their students for business, to foster business, and to give specialized courses leading to all kinds of business. The heads of the colleges should be business men, he said, "Culture for its own sake has gone up in smoke."

An editorial in *Scribner's* warned against our acquiring the faults of the German system in the tendency to let learning swamp common sense, tact, the sense of proportion, and the sense of humor. An article in *Review of Reviews* in 1901 undertook to answer the charge of business men that college graduates were "commercially inefficient." The writer urged that the colleges attend more seriously to the task of guiding students "to sane and self-directed manhood" and asserted that the luxury indulged in by college students was parasitic and was partly paid for by the miserably paid college professors. The *Forum* deplored the standards of the market

place and the counting-house in education and also its lack of touch with public affairs. A closer connection between higher education and public service would save politics from becoming materialistic and education from becoming monastic. Woodrow Wilson, in his inaugural as president of Princeton, declared that the colleges should deal with the spirits and not the fortunes of men. An editorial in the *Forum* discussed the need for shortening the college course; the *Nation* editorialized on "Education as a Public Peril" and warned against the relaxation of discipline; Lyman Abbott in the *Outlook* made a plea for the "Educational Rights of Man," urging the colleges to provide a broader education and the inclusion of religious instruction in the schools; Hamilton W. Mabie made a plea for the teaching of internationalism; Andrew S. Draper charged that the chief trouble in education was with disagreeing experts who kept the school stirred up; another writer cried out against uniform universal education; Professor George Trumbull Ladd, in "Disintegration and Reconstruction of Curriculum" in the *Forum*, urged that the curriculum be made over, that certain courses should be required, and that the liberal arts course be reduced to three years. He frowned upon the excessive and injudicious use of the elective system. For an increasing multitude of students education was "cram, cram to get into college and sham, sham to get through." Jealousies, prejudices, and the inhospitality of professors toward fields of study outside their own specialties prevented an intelligent reconstruction of the curriculum. Departments should coöperate and offer integrated courses, he said.

During the early years of the present century protests were being made widely against emphasis upon the business preparation of college students and also against the increasing departmentalism and those professors who knew little outside their own specialties—evidence of a definite influence of the graduate school. Preserved Smith, writing in *Educational Review* in 1913, charged that lack of co-ordination in instruction in the colleges and the disconnected way in which fragmentary information was imparted accounted for the un-



reality, unpracticality, and lack of inspiration in higher education. The professors should integrate their work instead of sidestepping for fear of treading upon another's subject. The *Nation* compared the university to a department store, saying that it was ceasing to be the home of idealism, and perhaps of ideas, and bemoaned the tendency to early specialization in college due to the influence of the business world; an article and an editorial in *The New York Times* in early October, 1913, charged that the colleges were turning out flabby dilettantes and substantially said that the last two years should be professionalized because business men demanded that the graduates whom they employed should have more mettle and determination; and the same paper three years later charged that higher education had not done its part in providing intellectual leaders, bewailed the lack of insight among so-called educated men, and in a measure made direful prophecies as to the economic future after the World War; an article in *Educational Review* in April, 1917, urged the ideals of a liberal education as against "the insidious and baleful influences of these omnipresent, well-meaning, wingless-minded educators who unconsciously conceive young men and women as more or less sublimated beasts and who regard colleges and universities as agencies for teaching the animals the art of getting shelter and raiment and food"; and a few months later the "Bigotry of the New Education" was assaulted by the great classicist Paul Shorey in the *Nation*, who protested against giving up all methods of education except those advocated by his former colleague at Chicago, John Dewey, and the latter's disciples; and in the year of the armistice William James made satirical war in *Educational Review* on "The Ph.D. Octopus," ridiculed the baleful domination of the American system of graduate instruction which insisted that professors must be decorated with a degree before they can teach in a college: ". . . the three magical letters were the thing seriously required. To admit a fox without a tail would be a degradation impossible to be thought of." In this remarkable piece of satire the great psychologist was



pointing an accusing finger at a tyranny that was to grow more and more modish in higher education and whose blind worship was to afflict undergraduate instruction.

These and many other discussions of higher education in this country prior to the World War seem to indicate the stubborn resistance of educational institutions to proposals for changes in their work. The explanation of this stubbornness since the days of the medieval universities may be found in the class or departmental struggles of the colleges. These struggles, which have waged since the stormy days of Abelard, still wage in the sheltered American colleges and universities, where earnest, if sometime vague, academic ideas continue to do battle among themselves as violently as that which has gone on among the economic forces that periodically drive men to despair. Moreover, in the story of these struggles may be seen a tendency of the colleges to lag behind movements for economic and social change until accumulated disaffection without or within the institutions compels readjustment, sometimes even by the methods of revolution.

Since 1929 the colleges and universities of the United States have been under severe criticism. Probably not all the cuts in their budgets have been made merely as economy measures. The ancient theory, so often invoked by the institutions of higher learning, that they are "free" may have appeared to the supporting public to carry the implication that they feel no responsibility to help the society that supports them to solve its economic, social, and political problems. But, unless all depression signs fail, the relation of the work of these institutions to those pressing problems will become increasingly a matter of serious concern to the public which supports higher education and to which it must finally account.

It seems a social misfortune that so much of the superstructure of any worthy social institution must occasionally weaken or crash to meet the needs of changed conditions among the human beings that support and depend upon it. Higher education has often been called upon to respond to really human needs before being forced to do so. But even

the adventurous and serene Eliot, who refounded and enlarged Harvard, was forced to turn "the place over as a flap-jack," as Oliver Wendell Holmes said of the young chemist-president, and in doing so he made out of a provincial college the most eminent university in the United States. This happened after 1869. And when Engineer Arthur Willard was elected president of the University of Illinois in March, 1934, he was reported to have promised the taxpayers of that State "a model of economy and service. This much I know," he said, "the universities are going to have to do a better job of turning out men and women who can take care of themselves. The average college graduate . . . has been prepared for everything but life." This is substantially what Adams had said fifty years earlier. President Willard's stricture on higher education is not new in the United States. Nor was Adams's bold criticism of Harvard entirely new. And many of the questions that have agitated American educational leaders, particularly since the World War, had been raised often in this country for nearly a hundred years before that catastrophe.

These questions are not only as insistent now as formerly, but the demand for energetic higher educational leadership in the United States now seems greater than at any time in the past.

## THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT

FLOYD M. RIDDICK

THE election of November 6, 1934, surprised all political observers. Never before in the history of American political parties has there been such a landslide for the Democratic party. In the next House of Representatives, a body of 435, there will be 317 Democratic members. This vast majority will undoubtedly offer no little trouble to the Democratic leaders in the House.

Taking cognizance of the above situation, the American people should focus their attention upon the incoming Congress. There is still a question of whether or not the Democratic leaders of the House will be able to control this huge majority of Democrats with which they will have to work. Will these leaders be able to prevent any splits in their own party, or will sectionalism outcrop when real battles are staged on the floor during this next session? Will the legislative program be directed by the President independent of the will of the Democratic members in the House, or will Congress fight the President and insist on doing the legislating without his advice? These questions cannot be answered yet. However, the personnel of Congress will be practically the same as that of the past one, and the President surely "directed" the legislation in the Seventy-third Congress. The House will have all of its old leaders back, except Speaker Rainey. It is unknown just yet who will take Rainey's place. According to precedence, Mr. Byrns, of Tennessee, will be the next Speaker.\* But, regardless of the positions assigned to the leaders, the same men will direct the procedure in the next House as in the past one. Therefore, if the leaders are to be the same and the party division nearly the same, it will only

\* Since this article went to press Mr. Byrns has been elected Speaker for the Seventy-fourth Congress.

be logical to conclude that the procedure in the Seventy-fourth Congress will be very similar to that of the Seventy-third. The past Congress convened on January 3, 1934, in joint session. President Roosevelt addressed that meeting. There were present at the gathering two political factions within the Democratic party. One group was ready and willing to eat from the hands of the President; the other, including those who followed him on various occasions for political purposes, was conservative.

Regardless of the division of opinion within the majority party, the Seventy-third Congress, toward which the President was paternalistic, made a unique record for itself. The amount of money appropriated and the major pieces of legislation enacted justify one in classifying the past Congress as an unusual legislative body. The vast amount of money appropriated will certainly be remembered. Congressional leaders have estimated the cost at \$17,000,000,000. Of this huge sum, \$7,000,000,000 were appropriated outright; the balance was authorized by the most generous peace-time Congress in the history of our country.

The number of bills introduced in the House was less than the number introduced in any House since the Fifty-third Congress, of 1893. The number of laws enacted was 976 as compared to 843 passed during the preceding Congress. The President vetoed seventy bills and two joint resolutions; one bill was passed over his veto.

President Roosevelt transmitted 88 messages; 504 communications were submitted by executive departments; and there were 5,201 petitions filed. Congress was in session only 197 days or 267 calendar days.

By and large, the session was extremely significant in the lives of the American people. Many far-reaching laws affecting the private life of nearly every citizen were hurriedly jammed through both Houses with minimum debate. The procedure under which these extraordinary measures were conducted was quite abnormal. The external forces acting upon the members of Congress as a result of the economic

conditions of the United States demanded such a course in order to remedy the social needs and alleviate distress.

In order to understand this abnormal procedure in the House during the past session of the Seventy-third Congress, one must have a conception of the actual circumstances existing. In this writing, therefore, the discussion will center around the influence wielded by the administration in the House, the composition of that body, and its leadership.

The President assumed the leading rôle in the legislative program, and the "old-timers" followed him throughout the entire session. Some of the regulars would not take orders from the heads of the departments, but remarked, "If the President says pass this bill, I am going to vote for it."

The leaders of the House at one time passed out word that there would be no stock market legislation; Roosevelt advised to the contrary; today stock exchanges operate under stock market regulation. The stock exchange regulation, however, was not exactly in the category of controversial legislation.

The President called the leaders to the White House to stand pat on his tariff proposal, and they did. The vote showed that only eleven Democrats bolted the party. Two hundred and sixty-nine Democrats voted for the measure; all Republicans except five were regular.

The President's monetary bill was adopted by a vote of 360 to 40. Joining with 287 Democrats in voting for the measure were sixty-eight Republicans and five Laborites; opposing the bill were thirty-eight Republicans and two Democrats.

No leaders of the House were antagonistic to the McLeod bill to pay off bank deposits when it was first introduced. It was not long, however, before the administration made known its opposition; the bill was never considered; nevertheless, some concession was given to the sponsors of the bill in the Steagall Banking Act.

The Banking and Currency Committee was hostile to the housing bill. Heedless of the will of the President, the Committee voted sixteen to four to back its substitute housing bill,

bitterly criticized by the administration. When the bill came to the floor of the House, the floor leader, Mr. Byrns, maintained a vigorous offensive throughout the day for the restoration of the original measure. The committee was flayed for its slashing revision of the President's measure. Finally, the provision stricken out by the committee but urged by the administration was adopted by a vote of 176 to 19.

There was never any consideration of the regular Wagner labor bill; the Wagner Compromise Bill was enacted. This measure was sent to the majority leader by the President on June 15. It was introduced in the House by Mr. Byrns the same day just prior to *sine die* adjournment. It was referred to the proper committee. The next morning the House convened at ten o'clock; it is doubtful if the members of the committee knew that the bill had been introduced; nevertheless, the bill passed the House between ten thirty and eleven o'clock. The bill was brought up before the House by unanimous consent and passed without a record vote.

President Roosevelt blocked the leaders' plans for an early adjournment. He urged that certain bills "must" pass before the end of the session, to which some of the leaders were opposed privately. He outlined his minimum program of "must" legislation which he wanted enacted; all others, some recommended by the administration, were sacrificed.

The President realized most of his desires. Nearly all the bills originating at the White House were finally enacted. Perhaps there were fifty measures, "big and little," including the appropriation bills, desired by the President. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the President's will was not absolute. His veto was overridden once; Secretary Ickes favored a bill to control oil which failed to be enacted; Congress passed the Railway Pension Bill and the President's signature was doubtful; the President consulted the Banking and Currency Committee concerning his gold bill, and it was given to the chairman of the same committee for introduction, but the gold bill was considered by the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee.

Mr. Roosevelt was able to realize the above results by virtue of his unusual prerogative. His decisions were not final; but he was in a position to "crack the whip." Fortunately for him, as a result of the "emergency," many jobs were created, and the administration was the final judge of whom should fill the posts. And it will be recalled by the job-seekers just what an important part the "black list" played in the job-seeking game.

The House had a vast majority of Democrats, so-called Democrats. The party line-up was: Democrats 313, Republicans 113, Laborites 5, and vacancies 4. The division can best be expressed by repeating the words of a Democrat to the Republicans, namely: "What are you worrying about? Your Republicans could hold your caucus meeting in a telephone booth."

Really the Democrats had a tremendous majority to be so weak. There were any number of political battles staged during the session, and they were not all absolute victories for the majority party. The forces were fairly equally divided for several skirmishes. As a result, when very important measures were to arise the leaders would usually conclude that it was sagacious to "gag" the members by some unusual rule sent in by the Rules Committee, before consideration of the actual measure, to hold the members in line. The leaders were apparently afraid of their own members. One of the leaders stated that "better results could be accomplished with fifty less members of his own party if they were real Democrats."

Much of the procedure was rather autocratic during this past Congress. Admittedly there was too much dictatorship by certain leaders at times. But it must be admitted that no achievements could be made if there were no "leaders." The House must have leaders; all business organizations in this country have heads. It is absolutely necessary that somebody be responsible for formulating and executing the program. This responsibility fell upon the following commission, namely: the Speaker, Mr. Rainey; the majority floor leader, Mr. Byrns; the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. Bank-



head; and the Steering Committee. This commission can not be classified as the most brilliant in American congresses. It must be conceded, however, that they made a good job of putting through their program and blocking all legislation to the contrary, especially when one considers the nature of the bills which were thrust upon them to enact.

The Speaker is no longer the leader he once was. Each chairman is practically the boss of his committee, and they looked to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to know what to do. However, a very active part was assumed by Mr. Rainey in helping to enact the program of the administration. In fact he voted more often than any other Speaker in memory. The House voted eighty-two times during the session by roll call; the Speaker voted on twenty-three of these occasions.

He also took an unusual interest in how the party voted. He ordered a detailed check to show the action of the members of his party on twenty-seven different issues. Of course, nothing drastic could be done to a member for bolting his party; however, the Speaker held these names which constituted the "black list." And one can imagine how often this information was utilized.

Further, the Speaker did not fail to use his post to the advantage of his party when it could be done within the rules of the House. On one occasion when the House was voting on the veterans clause of the Independent office bill, the returns of the vote were held up quite a while. The vote was very close, namely, 190 to 189. The Speaker ordered a recapitulation. This delayed the final decision and at the same time gave the leaders time to bargain with the members on the floor; that is, to get them to reconsider. The final vote was 189 to 190; this blocked the amendment opposed by the leaders.

The floor leader, a tall, gaunt Tennessean, like Mr. Rainey, is a veteran of twenty-six years of Congressional service. He is a sincere and persistent worker. Some of the New Deal legislation he privately disliked; on the floor of the House he was a regular. He played the usual rôle of directing the pro-

gram. The members of the House looked to their leader to learn what to do and when to do it. Into his office went the bills before they were acted upon; "out of his office they went and stood upon the order of their going." Bills are rarely ever considered on the floor of the House before the leader is consulted. On Suspension day, however, the program is subjected to the discretion of the Speaker. It is entirely within the power of the Speaker to recognize whomsoever he chooses. To illustrate from the *Records*:

MR. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader about when and how it is proposed to bring up the relief appropriation measure.

MR. BYRNS. That will not come up today, but it is understood it will come up on Monday.

MR. TABER. Under suspension of the rules?

MR. BYRNS. I understand so. Of course the Speaker can answer that better than I can, but I understand the Speaker will recognize some one to move to pass the bill under suspension of the rules on Monday. At the same time, the Consent Calendar will be called.

MR. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

MR. BYRNS. I yield.

MR. SNELL. Of course if that bill is passed under suspension of the rules the gentleman will be able to give us a little more time for debate than the regular 20 minutes?

MR. BYRNS. I would hope so. Of course, I would not want to make any agreement about that in the absence of the chairman of the committee, who will have charge of the bill, but I am sure he will be willing to get together on some kind of an agreement with the gentleman.

MR. SNELL. I think we ought to have additional time at least on this important measure.

MR. BYRNS. I feel very sure the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Buchanan) will be agreeable to that idea, but, of course, I cannot commit him.

Mr. Byrns was not a militant dictator. Mr. Byrns and Mr. Rainey both entreated rather than commanded. Nevertheless, there were times when these men were criticized severely. The opponents stated that there were too many "gags." The Democrats have a sufficient majority. To "gag" the House indicates one of two attitudes, namely: the leaders were afraid of their own members or the measures were not meri-

torious enough to justify enactment. If the leaders could not guide the House safely with a three to one majority, the opponents stated, something must be radically wrong.

Fellow members were always given consideration by the floor leader. Mr. Byrns acknowledged the positions of others and never attempted to assume power which did not belong to him. On the contrary, the members of the House were aware of the leader's position; they realized that it was expensive to ignore him.

Frequently the leader took the floor in behalf of the administration. He would warn the members when they went astray and would object to procedure not in line with the program, always with little opposition. Mr. Byrns would object to others, but when he made a request it was nearly always granted. Often certain members would reserve objections, but in the final show down all opposition was too weak.

Relations of the majority leader with the minority leader were very satisfactory. The minority, even though small, was never absolutely ignored by the Tennessean. Any number of tentative agreements were made on the outside between the majority floor leader and the minority leader, Mr. Snell; on the floor they were utilized. It has been stated by one writer that, as minority leader, all Mr. Snell "leads these days is a quiet life." This was a decided exaggeration. Quite frequently the minority leader made himself felt. He had a small number to support him, but they were certainly organized, and Mr. Snell always handled them to advantage.

The minority leader disclosed the weight of his threat when the Bankhead bill was under consideration. A certain tentative agreement had been made between Mr. Byrns and Mr. Snell as to when the vote would be taken. Changes in the program set up new conditions. Mr. Byrns no longer felt obligated. But Mr. Snell had granted leaves to many of his men for the week-end. Under the change, the time set for the vote would have caught some of the Republicans absent. The minority leader, therefore, objected to the change. He inquired if the tentative agreement had no weight. The other

Democratic leaders involved hesitated to take cognizance of the agreement. Yet Mr. Snell's desire was realized. He stated that up until then he had done all he could to finish the bill. "We co-operated so far as we could to get the bill up to the previous question, and if you are going to go back on that tentative agreement, there will be some opposition on this side today."

Mr. Bankhead, the chairman of the Rules Committee, held a very important post. Naturally the chairman of a committee is considered as the superior member of the committee, and this is even more true in the case of the chairman of the Rules Committee. The chairman of the Rules Committee has much influence in making the program for the House.

The Rules Committee is not a legislative committee; its functions are largely to care for procedure. The majority party always has a greater proportion of members on the Rules Committee than on any other standing committee. This committee acts as a direct agent of the party. Much of the time of the committee is spent getting opinions and sentiments of the House in order to determine what special rules should be brought before the House for consideration.

Chairmen of the various committees always consult the majority leader before requesting a special rule from the Rules Committee. The particular chairman then appears before the Rules Committee; there he requests that the committee grant him a special rule for the consideration of a certain bill. If the request is granted, the resolution (the special rule) is debated one hour, the time being equally divided. The rule is then adopted or rejected.

The number of special rules adopted by the House was far greater than the number adopted by any House under normal procedure. There were fifty-six such resolutions introduced and referred to the Rules Committee. Thirty-six of this number were considered by the House; thirty-four were adopted. Many of these rules were closed rules. The sole purpose of the others was to bring the measure concerned from some hidden place on the Calendar to immediate consideration.

Two waived the right to amend the bills, except amendments offered by the committee handling the bill. Seventeen carried clauses waiving points of order against the bills. These clauses were added to prevent certain complications. The leaders had thought it best to close these doors before consideration of the measure.

Seven of the above resolutions were never debated. As soon as the issue was placed before the House the previous question would be ordered.

The most severe rule to be adopted was considered on June 1; it too was adopted without debate. The rule was designed to block filibuster. The Republicans insisted on filibuster to force the session to last until June 11. This would have permitted a consideration of the Discharge Calendar, and of the McLeod bill on that calendar. The filibuster was begun on the last day of May; on June 1, it took nearly three hours to dispose of the *Journal*; ordinarily it takes five to ten minutes. This circumstance set the stage. The Democrats were so angry that they would have voted to agree to almost any rule. The vote on that resolution was 240 to 92. Only four Democrats bolted the party; all the Republicans were regular.

This autocratic rule provided that during the remainder of the session the Speaker could entertain motions to suspend the rules, regardless of the rules of the House. The majority leader could move that the House recess at any time, and the motion was made of highest privilege. Reports from the Rules Committee might be considered the same day the report was made to the House by a bare majority. Under normal procedure a special rule from the Rules Committee must be reported at least one day before its consideration, unless the House by a two-thirds vote determines to consider it on the day reported.

The above rule fortified the leaders of the House to block the consideration of the Discharge Calendar. Immediately after the rule was adopted the House began to recess from one day to the next. It recessed the 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8th. On the 11th, the subsequent discharge day, a member rose and

asked to discharge a certain committee from the consideration of a particular bill. The Speaker ruled that seven legislative days had not elapsed; when the House recesses, the legislative day stays the same and the House procedure as set by the rules remains as if only one day had elapsed. As a result of that decision, Congress would have had to remain in session until the 4th Monday of June to reach another discharge day. This blocked all possibility for the consideration of the McLeod bill during that session. The will of the administration had been to block the bill; the skillful parliamentary maneuvering on the part of the Democratic leaders accomplished that purpose.

The Steering Committee, or the policy-forming committee, was composed of fifteen members representing fifteen respective districts, plus four ex officio members. The Speaker, Mr. Rainey; the majority floor leader, Mr. Byrns; the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. Bankhead; and the chairman of the caucus, Mr. Lea, were the ex officio members of the Committee. The chairman of the committee was Mr. Crosser, of Ohio.

The Steering Committee was something new in the Democratic party. This Committee generally held meetings once a week. The function of the group was, in a general way, to determine the policy of the Democratic party in the House. It never considered a matter unless it was of vital interest to the party. The group was in the true sense of the word a policy-forming committee. Each member of the Committee kept in touch with his own particular group; he gathered the opinions of his assembly and submitted them to the Committee. The Committee then took its actions in the light of such information.

Admittedly, the maneuvering of this commission was greatly responsible for the enactment of the past complicated legislative program in the House. This Congress, perhaps more than any other in the memory of present-day political observers, manifested a sincere willingness and determina-

tion to coöperate with the Chief Executive. The House co-operated with the executive department to such an extent that obviously the judgment of this body as a separate department of government was relinquished in favor of the nation's leader, President Roosevelt.



## A MERCHANT-PLANTER OF THE OLD SOUTH ✓

JOSIAH MOFFATT

WILLIAM MOFFATT'S house was built on the brow of a wooded hill, a hundred yards north of the Charlotte-Columbia road. To the Negroes it was known as the "Big House." Sometimes a more inclusive phrase, "The Hill," was used to designate the house with its outhouses. It was not a large house except in a comparative sense. The majestic grandeur of the Colonial mansion was lacking.

It was a long, rambling frame structure, a story and a half high, with the upstairs lighted chiefly by dormer windows projecting from the front slope of the roof. There were two chimneys at each end of the house and a wide, front veranda extending its full length. Locally verandas were known as piazzas (pronounced *pie-az-zers*). A low, L-shaped building, connected with the "Big House" by a covered passage, contained the kitchen and dining-room. This arrangement made for comfort, inasmuch as the sights, sounds, odors, and especially the heat associated with the preparation of food, were entirely eliminated from the sacred precincts of the "Big House," where the White folks awaited, in unruffled dignity and repose, the clamor of the bell announcing dinner or supper. Beyond the kitchen, within the yard inclosure, were the granary, the smokehouse, and dairy and, back of these, outside the yard, the Negro quarters. Altogether, the group of buildings on "The Hill" presented a rather imposing front to the big road. My grandfather's store stood at the foot of the hill, right on the road. Across the road from it were the gin-house and cotton press.

My grandfather was never a large slaveholder. He probably never owned more than two dozen slaves at one time. He amassed his fortune in the mercantile business and, while he operated a plantation of seven hundred acres, his chief agricultural interests lay in the crops of his customers, upon

which depended their ability to pay their bills at the store, when they fell due in the autumn. William Moffatt began his career as a merchant on the proverbial shoestring. He was the son of a Scotch-Irish emigrant who settled on a farm in Chester District, South Carolina, about 1770, and he was born three years before our first president took office.

That was the heyday of "sturdy individualism" in America. Liberty was on a rampage, so to speak, tolerating no restraints. This was true both of states and the individuals composing them. South Carolina was one of the leading states in the loose confederacy which included the thirteen original colonies and their dependencies. Charleston was one of the four largest cities of the country and an important seaport. A poor German emigrant named John Jacob Astor had just arrived in New York. George Washington was reputed to be the richest man in America by long odds, but his actual wealth probably never exceeded a million dollars.

The Federal Government, if such it could be called before the adoption of the Constitution, exercised few powers in or over the various states, which to all intents and purposes were independent commonwealths and very jealous of their status as such. Many of the more timid and conservative citizens were filled with misgivings concerning the future of the newly launched ship of state, and openly advocated the restoration of the monarchy with another King George—George Washington.

There were no industries, in even the infant stage, no government aid for any person or any enterprise, and very little capital available for any purpose. On the other hand, there were no unemployment, no bread lines, no overproduction, no labor trouble, and no liquor problem (whiskey was almost as free and widely diffused as air). Jails and almshouses, where they existed at all, were vacant most of the time. At least four-fifths of the population lived on farms.

Social and economic conditions had changed very little when William Moffatt opened his little store twenty-five years later. His meager capital did not exceed three hundred dol-

lars, but he was a born trader and strictly honest. He prospered from the first, and it was not long before he was compelled to move from his loghouse with its nail-studded door into a more commodious store building, weatherboarded and well-lighted.

For about forty years Billy Moffatt's store was the trading center of a large territory embracing portions of several counties (then called "districts") and extending even beyond the state line. There was no considerable town between Charlotte and Columbia. The county seat was often a straggling village in which the courthouse was the only conspicuous building. There were no stores of any consequence within twenty miles of Lewisville, that being the name of the postoffice at Moffatt's store and the community in which it was situated.

People would come a day's journey, on horseback, in wagons or lumbering carriages, to trade with Billy Moffatt. They would spend the night as his guests and return home the next day. His hospitality knew no bounds and was not confined to customers. The man who was loading his wagon with hundreds of dollars worth of supplies was made no more welcome at his table than the casual stranger who happened to be in the store at meal time. Both were expected to climb the hill with him and stretch their legs under the groaning board in the dining-room. An extra mouth to feed caused no flurry in the kitchen, for "company" was expected every day. The great kitchen was constantly seething with activity from dawn until bedtime. Its fireplace was six-feet wide, and the wide flagstone hearth covered more floor space than the kitchens in many modern houses.

The kitchen cupboard, built of solid black walnut, native to the region, reached to the ceiling-beams and stretched more than halfway across the end of the room.

The cooking was all done in the fireplace or over beds of live coals on the hearth. There was no stove or range of any kind installed in my grandfather's time. The pantry shelves were always loaded with pies, cakes, and great loaves of salt-rising lightbread. Hot, beaten biscuits, Johnny cake, corn

pone, or delicious pan bread were served with every meal. Meats were roasted on the turnspit; hams were boiled in iron pots. Fried chicken and mush for breakfast, baked chicken and rice for dinner were regular standbys. Patches supplied roasting ears, turnips, and both sweet and Irish potatoes. The kitchen garden provided an abundance of green vegetables in season.

Quantities of jams, jellies, and preserves, including brandied peaches, were put up every summer, a large, brass preserving kettle being kept in almost constant use during the season. Blackberry wine and cordials were produced by the gallon, chiefly for medicinal purposes. They were especially designed to counteract the diarrhea which prevailed to an alarming extent among the children during the summer.

The clerks at the store ate their meals in the family dining-room but slept at the store, in a room partitioned off for a dormitory. Their washing was done by the family washerwomen. The ashhopper furnished the lye for the manufacture of a home-made soap of superlative excellence, and the washerwomen did beautiful work. Indeed the White folks would tolerate nothing less than snowy whiteness in their linen. Quite a number of well-trained servants were kept busy performing the varied tasks incident to such a baronial ménage, but none was overworked.

One of my grandfather's clerks, who afterwards became a leading merchant and banker, bore rueful testimony to what he, at the time, regarded as the extreme consideration shown his Negroes by their master. In those days fresh beef was obtained, by an arrangement among certain neighbors to butcher their fatlings in rotation, so as to furnish a weekly supply for each household. Each member of the "circle" had to go or send for his portion. The erstwhile clerk declared that on a cold, dreary winter morning "Uncle Billy" would compel him to mount a horse and go after the beef, while three or four big "buck niggers" sat dozing around the kitchen fire.

Doubtless my respected forbear, who believed in stern discipline for the young, had nothing else in mind than the good

of the boy's soul. He and other clerks were admitted to the Moffatt store, while mere boys, practically upon terms of apprenticeship. Not only so, but the opportunity to enter Billy Moffatt's service under such conditions was highly coveted by poor but ambitious youths, anxious to go into training for a business career under the most successful merchant of the Piedmont. The founders of several leading mercantile and banking houses of the up-country and Tennessee owed their success, primarily at least, to the business maxims of William Moffatt, whose store was the best "Business College" of its day, judging by the accomplishments of its "graduates."

For many years William Moffatt hauled his goods from Charleston in covered wagons with bodies shaped like gondolas. Charleston was distant about two hundred miles and it required almost a fortnight to make the round-trip. Twice a-year, spring and fall, the wagon train, consisting of five or six wagons, each drawn by two or three spans of mules, went to Charleston to receive the goods transported by water from New York and Philadelphia. The wagons were loaded, going and coming, carrying down cotton and fetching back merchandise. A white boss was in charge of the train, but the skilled teamsters were always intelligent, dependable Negroes. Of course the merchant himself could not afford a wagon train of such magnitude, but many of the large planters kept one or more crack teams for their own use and were glad enough to hire them out occasionally. There was always the proviso however that their own teamsters, to whom the mules were accustomed, should drive the wagons.

The teams of fine, matched mules were brought through the country in droves by traders from the breeding farms of Kentucky and Tennessee. They were the pride of their owners and the peculiar joy of the dusky geniuses who drew the lines over their backs. The teamster must know his mules, individually and collectively. He recognized the fact that each long-eared hybrid was a distinct personality. No two mules are exactly alike in disposition, popular opinion to the contrary. The teamster spoke to them caressingly by name

and cultivated an intimate acquaintance with the idiosyncrasies of each one of his charges.

The long, wicked-looking whip of rawhide attached to a home-made handle was seldom used by an expert teamster upon his mules. It was the symbol of his office. The rapidity with which he could unfold its sinuous length above the heads of his mules, producing a succession of sharp, explosive sounds resembling pistol shots, was truly remarkable. Skilled drivers cracked their whips so that the resultant explosions sounded like a continuous volley. This proved much more effective in enforcing discipline or producing speedy and harmonious action than stinging blows administered to the individual units of the teams.

The mule's shining harness was often decorated with little bronze or silver bells which kept up a continuous tintinnabulation when the team was on the move. The progress of a wagon train along the highway was dignified and unhurried. The matched teams, moving in perfect unison, were trained to a fast walk. They usually covered about four miles an hour, a speed that could be maintained with ease for ten hours a-day. The mules were fed at midday when the wagon train halted for a long rest. When the train stopped for the night, the mules were curried, rubbed down, and fed again.

You may well imagine the ecstatic thrill that seized the darkies in wayside fields, when the tinkling of the bells, mingled with the melodious voices of singing teamsters, announced the approach of a wagon train. Shouts of welcome, exchanges of rough but friendly badinage, and bursts of joyous laughter marked the passing of the train. It was a great event in plantation life. But wagon trains, no matter how picturesque, could not compete with railway trains. With the changing order, long hauls with wagons became unprofitable. Even in the thirties, the railroad from Charleston had reached Columbia, sixty miles distant from Moffatt's store.

In 1846 occurred the celebrated "cold summer." The season was so short and lacking in heat that Indian corn did not mature and crops in general were a complete failure. There



resulted a "famine in the land" or something so nearly resembling that ancient biblical disaster that the inhabitants were thrown into a panic. Wagons proved utterly inadequate. Their antiquated transportation system completely broke down under the strain of trying to move food and forage long distances, as quickly and in such quantities as the emergency demanded. The merchants and planters of the region unanimously decided that they must have a railroad. Some years later when the Charlotte and South Carolina Railroad had been completed, the "Big House" was within seven miles of the nearest railway station, at Lewis' Turnout. The whistle of the locomotive could be heard on a clear day, and a wagon could haul two loads of goods in a day instead of one in two weeks.

There were no beautifully groomed mules to be spared for spectacular display in the lean and hungry days immediately following the Civil War. The landed aristocrats were in sore straits and the aristocratic quadrapeds shared their masters' plight. The upkeep of a big, imposing wagon with even a four-mule team spelled ruin for the poverty-stricken post-bellum planter. However, in the Lewisville community, there was one man ready to face the consequences of a romantic adherence to ancient customs. John Knox, Gentleman, was something of a dreamer and a sentimentalist and, as usual with gentlemen of that ilk, very impractical. It must have been a terrible strain on his fallen fortunes to maintain such a team after the war, but he did so for a number of years, sinking more hopelessly into the slough of debt, all the time.

We children used to run to the gate to watch the swanky Knox team go by. Long Jim McColor was the teamster, the last of the rollicking, care-free masters of the whip who, for generations, has been the envy of their fellows. We saw six stately mules of one color and size, in shining, brass-mounted harness with tiny silver bells attached, drawing a wagon that, to our childish eyes, seemed as big as a small schooner and was painted a brilliant carmine. Long Jim enthroned in solitary grandeur, his lines in hand, guided his craft with the



skill of a master pilot. It was almost equal to a circus parade, but the wiser heads were shaken in solemn disapproval. Poor, old John! He couldn't last much longer with that white elephant on his hands! Painful as it may seem to the romantically inclined, it must be truthfully recorded that the prophets of evil hit the nail on the head.

Long Jim McColor was a tall, lean, coffee-colored darkey with a flair for the dramatic. He was one of Uncle Henry's former slaves. Many of the freedmen retained the names of their former master, but some of the more aggressively independent, feeling that these were symbols of bondage, discarded them for names of their own choosing. Thus, without legislative or judicial sanction, "Jim Moffatt" became "Jim McColor." It was customary to accept the new names as legal designations, in spite of the fact that some darkies changed their names so often that they accumulated a number of aliases.

Long Jim was the reputed husband of "Aunt Viny," the fat, black goddess of the fires who reigned over the Henry Moffatt kitchen. To be strictly accurate, the statement should be confined to the fact that he was the reputed father of most of her numerous progeny. There had been no benefit of clergy in their union, that is certain. Trial marriage is far from being a modern idea. It was quite commonly practiced among the Negroes of long ago. They just "took up" with one another at pleasure and parted as casually to "take up" with other soul mates when the fancy seized them. The mother usually retained all the children of her successive and informal matrimonial ventures. Each of these became an asset as soon as able to pick cotton or swing a hoe. An established reputation as a cook was of great value to a mother, such as Viny, after freedom had shifted family responsibilities from the master's shoulders to her own. She fed her brood from the White folk's larder, clothed them with hand-me-downs from the Big House and, of course, paid no rent for her cabin.

It may shock the sensibilities of some of the abstemious

and aggressively "dry" Carolinians, but candor compels me to record the fact that William Moffatt sold liquor at his store. Furthermore, he was no teetotaler himself, although he never drank to excess. It was the custom of the times. No stigma attached to the sale of liquors and wines in bottles, barrels, and jugs. Practically all merchants keeping general stores sold liquor, as a matter of course, just as they did dry goods and groceries. No liquor was sold by the drink, as in public taverns. Whiskey and rum were drawn from the spigots of barrels and hogsheads into bottle and jugs to suit the convenience or pocketbook of the customer. Fine French brandies and foreign wines were distributed in the original packages, to a limited clientele among the wealthy planters.

Wine was served at William Moffatt's table and a decanter of the finest brandy stood on his sideboard, drinks being offered to guests as a matter of common hospitality, visiting ministers not being excepted. Few refused to imbibe, and there was no reflection upon the Christian character of either guest or host because of this custom. My grandmother, as her two boys grew older, being persuaded that social and convivial drinking by her husband and his guests, *between meals*, set a bad example to her sons, finally induced him to banish the decanter from the sideboard, but wine continued to be served at the Moffatt table long after my grandfather's death and even after the close of the Civil War.

I have alluded to the droves of horses and mules from Kentucky and Tennessee, driven through the country by traders and from which the planters replenished their stables, but this was not all. Traders bought up slaves in Virginia and brought them down into the Carolinas, finding a ready sale for them to planters because of an ever increasing need for toilers in their cotton and rice fields.

It was thus that "Anthony" entered the family circle to become the playmate and, later, the body servant of "Marse Joe" (the writer's father). One of these traders in human flesh had requested and obtained permission to camp for the night, with his "wares," in an open space near the store. My

grandmother, moved with compassion for the poor creatures, sent them generous quantities of food from her own kitchen and went down to the camp herself to see what else could be done to alleviate their miseries. There she saw poor, little five-year-old Anthony, sitting by the campfire, crying pitiously for his "Mammy." She made inquiries and learned that the child's mother had died a few days before, soon after the "drove" began its southward march. All her motherly instincts were aroused and she gave her husband no peace until he had consented to buy the boy and give him to her.

It was a happy day for Anthony when he passed into the hands of "Ole Miss," than whom a kinder, more indulgent mistress never lived. Anthony used to visit the old home, in my childhood. He seemed to cherish a sincere affection for the family, particularly for "Ole Miss" and for myself, the only surviving son and namesake of the idolized Josiah, his boyhood chum, who died two weeks before my birth.

He had a simple dignity of manner, a sonorous voice, and expressed himself with a purity of diction that marked him as a born orator, but he never attained any eminence except as a preacher for a small country congregation of his own people. The name "Anthony" must have been conferred upon him in Virginia. It is not at all probable that "Ole Miss" would have chosen the appellation of Caesar's eulogist for her *protégé*. She would have recalled that he afterwards became the paramour of the infamous queen of Egypt.

The cotton gin, invented by Eli Whitney about 1790, lifted the fleecy staple to its position of supremacy as a money crop. Cotton production on a large scale could never have been made profitable without it. It was the only agricultural machine in common use on Southern plantations for more than seventy-five years.

There were many crude devices for lightening labor to be found here and there, such as corn-shellers and feed-choppers, but they had no effect on the labor market. I recall a couple of these rather futile machines at the old home. They stood, dust-covered and forgotten in a corner of the barn until they

fell to pieces from senile decay. Left to themselves, the Negroes simply would not use them, but went merrily on husking and shelling corn by hand and chopping up feed with long, sharp knives.

Even in the late seventies there had been little change in the *modus operandi* on the farm since Colonial days. For instance, there was at that time no well on "the hill" (in the yard of the big house). Yet no one thought of trying to save time and labor by having a well dug on the hill. There were plenty of "niggers" to "tote" the water from distant sources and plenty of time to do it in. Why make a change? The water from a new well might not prove to be so good. This last named objection was not so far-fetched.

Cold, delicious, soft water was obtained from two sources, the well in the lot and the spring at the foot of the hill, on the other side of the house. Grandma was partial to the water from the spring, endowed with imaginary virtues because of early associations. The washing was done at the spring, beside the rivulet that flowed from it, known as the Spring Branch.

All the water for drinking and bathing, as well as for kitchen and dairy use, was fetched in cedar pails, by hand and head, uphill a distance of more than a hundred paces. Most of this portage was done by women servants. Persons not acquainted with the facts might picture to themselves these water carriers as poor, spiritless creatures, with forms bent and twisted out of human semblance by such heavy drudgery. Occasional visitors from the North, full of sympathy for the downtrodden victims of the White man's love of ease, were astonished beyond measure by the poise, vigor, and graceful carriage of many of the Negro women. "Toting" three pails of water at a time, uphill, a hundred paces or more, not once but several times a-day, is a form of exercise guaranteed to keep a woman in the pink of condition, to give grace and poise to the carriage, and to remove surplus fat from the abdominal area. One pail was carried in each hand and one on the head, and not a drop was spilled from the pail on the head.

A year or two before his death, which occurred in 1851, William Moffatt retired from active participation in his mercantile business. Dr. William Wylie, intimate friend and family physician of many years standing, issued an ultimatum when the aging merchant found himself unable longer to climb the hill from the store to the "Big House." His beloved Peggy persuaded him with many entreaties to heed the warning. He surrendered the management of the store into the hands of Joseph Wylie, a capable young man who had been with him many years and could be depended on to conduct the business in accordance with the maxims and methods of its founder. He afterwards established the great mercantile house in Chester, S. C., which still bears his name. Lyle Roddey, who afterwards founded the flourishing industrial city of Rock Hill, S. C., was a youthful clerk in the Moffatt store at the time my grandfather retired from its active management. A life of comparative inactivity proved irksome to William Moffatt. He was primarily and essentially a merchant, and cared little for the leisurely existence of a wealthy planter to which he must now adapt himself. Old Tom, his faithful Negro overseer who had been intrusted with the oversight of his fellow workers for many years, was still on the job and needed little assistance or advice from his master. A pig-headed old scoundrel was Tom. He would listen reverently, hat in hand, to his master's orders and then go out and do as he pleased.

William Moffatt had to admit, however, that Tom was an invaluable servant. He jollied the other darkies along and got all the necessary work done with very little friction. The plantation seemed to run itself like a well-oiled machine. When he felt equal to the mild exertion of a horseback ride, he would mount his gently ambling Kentucky mare, after breakfast, and make a tour of inspection to see if fences were in order and the hands were busy at their tasks.

Sometimes he would take long drives over quiet country roads, with Peggy by his side. The lovely landscape, the alternating fields and woodland glades, was viewed with an

ever fresh and naïve delight by one who had spent most of his days cooped up in a store. The carriage was a massive vehicle, handsomely upholstered. He had paid seven hundred dollars for it in Philadelphia. It was equipped with springs of the latest pattern which greatly reduced the discomfort of travel over rough roads. Many of the ponderous carriages on adjacent plantations were as innocent of springs as an ox-cart.

He was always tickled by the impressive dignity of his coachman, Jack (baptized Andrew Jackson). Regardless of the season, Jack's fat form was swathed in a double-breasted blue army coat discarded by some returned hero of the Mexican War. Oozing sweat at every pore, his woolly pate crowned with an ancient and battered beaver that had been white in some forgotten period of its existence, Jack was an awe-inspiring spectacle, the envy of all the "field niggers" and the hero of all the kitchen wenches.

In the drowsy dusk of a midsummer day, as William Mofatt sat nodding on his front piazza, he was aroused by the boisterous laughter and singing of returning picknickers. These were his own Negroes. Usually the crop was "laid by" before the Fourth of July and the hands were permitted to go to the Catawba River on the Fourth for a big frolic and fish-fry. A jug or two of "corn" was a great aid to hilarity and enhanced the pleasure of devouring unlimited quantities of tasty catfish. The season was late this year and the work of "laying by" had continued through the Fourth, the fishfry being postponed until the work was finished.

Suddenly he noticed someone hurrying up the hill from the store. It was Joseph Wylie. He arose to meet him. "What is it, Joseph? Anything wrong at the store?"

"No, I just ran up to tell you that President Taylor died this morning."

"There must be some mistake. How could you hear the news so soon?"

"A man who has been attending court in Chester just stopped at the store on his way home. He heard Squire McAliley read the telegram in the court room."

So that was it! Morse's wonderful invention had made possible this seeming miracle. He, William Moffatt, sitting on the piazza at his home, more than four hundred miles from the nation's capital, had heard of the death of the President of the United States, on the same day that it occurred! It had taken almost a week for news of William Henry Harrison's death to reach Chester.

Steamboats, railroads, and now the telegraph! A marvellous new era was opening up for mankind. Rapid transit, instantaneous communication between distant points, these things would revolutionize business, yea, life itself. But it was not for him. He belonged to the Old Order and was passing away with it. He surmised, without much regret, that the next Fourth of July would not find him here.



# B · O · O · K · S

## RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY OF EARLY AMERICA

DEISM IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY AMERICA. By Herbert A. Morais. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. 193. \$3.50.

The religious philosophy of early America seems to be attracting increasing attention from researchers working as specialists in history or the philosophy of religion. Mr. Miller's *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts*, Mr. Koch's *Republican Religion*, Mr. Haroutunian's *Piety Versus Moralism*, and now Mr. Morais's *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*—all serve to call attention to this increasing interest. Do such works as these indicate a trend in historiography toward ideology, or do they merely show that while professors of church history are clambaking or napping students from other fields are stealing their best subjects? Whatever the answer, the fact is clear that the history of religious ideas provides an attractive playground for modern footnote hunters.

Mr. Morais interprets deism as its history in this country seems to justify. He traces its backgrounds in England and in France, finding the closest connection of the American movement with the cautious-tempered liberalism of eighteenth-century England. The rise of an anti-clerical spirit during the years 1713 to 1763 provides him with the beginnings of deism in this country; the Revolutionary period, with an epoch of increasing awareness of its advance; and the early national era (1789-1805), with the flowering of militant deism under the leadership of Thomas Paine and Elihu Palmer. The history of the reaction on the part of the churches against militant deism concludes his volume—and rightly so, for by the time that the excesses of the French Revolution were forgotten and Tom Paine had been popularly niched forever as an "atheist," deism lapsed from public consciousness, to be replaced, later, by the Higher Criticism of Germanic birth.

Mr. Morais keeps his nose pretty closely on the track of his radicals and deists, even undertaking to ferret out the religious views of the signers of the Declaration of Independence; but in the course of his scurrying through many details he manages to stop now and then for a few conclusions. These are, of course, of great value, for he has based them largely upon primary sources, including the periodicals of the times. For example, he finds that up to the year 1776 deism was still "an aristocratic cult," confined to relatively few intellectuals residing in the larger towns. He finds, moreover, that the clergymen themselves, with their pulpit counterblasts and their missionary societies,

were responsible for much of the hullabaloo about militant deism, for the "infidelity" of Volney, Voltaire, Paine, and Palmer "attracted an attention out of proportion to its actual influence." The frontier, long considered to have been the stamping grounds of squirrel-hunting deists, appears to have been merely "indifferent" to religion, and no definite relationship between Jeffersonian politics and religious heresy can be established.

A study based largely on the religious views of a host of individuals must perforce have its shortcomings. These are most evident in Mr. Morais's discussion of the latitudinarians in New England and elsewhere who paved the way for later onslaughts against the clergy. In one general matter it may appear that the author has not sufficiently developed an idea which is implicit in the aggregation of his details; namely, that a large part of the anti-clerical movement in eighteenth-century America came as a simple reaction against the over-emphasis placed upon the five points of Calvinism. The heresies of Ethan Allen and many others can best be explained not by the influence of English rationalism or the spread of Newtonian science but by a natural revolt of vigorous minds against the trammeling theories of John Calvin and his American followers.

Students of the ideology of the South will find certain portions of this book of interest, particularly pages 13, 17, 19, 82, 84, 93, 95, 104, 112, 142, 149, 155, 162, and 176. Although the South in general throughout the century seems to have been "less conspicuous" so far as deistic speculation is concerned, an early president of the University of North Carolina, Joseph Caldwell, found upon his arrival in Chapel Hill that so many of his faculty were "infidels" that he was unable to converse with them. So far as this section of the country is involved in his study, there is a possibility that Mr. Morais may have passed by a few scattered heretics with the same unconsciousness that marks his use of commas.

CLARENCE GOHDES.

#### BIOGRAPHY OF HEROIC FIGURE

**MERIWETHER LEWIS, OF LEWIS AND CLARK.** By Charles Morrow Wilson. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1934. Pp. xiii, 305. \$3.00.

Meriwether Lewis deserves a better biography, one with less imagination and fewer journalistic crudities, more solid fact and sounder interpretation. As Jefferson's secretary, co-leader of that remarkable expedition to the Pacific coast and return, and as governor-general of

the Louisiana Territory, it is certain that Lewis was, in many respects, a heroic figure, and one whom Americans should not forget. However, we do think the author is straining the matter a bit when he calls Lewis "the Charles Augustus Lindbergh of 1807." Mr. Wilson's boast that he has not followed any "complex formulas for prying out information," we fear, is all too true. An incomplete bibliography does not seem to be offset by the author's statement that he has used the archives of the State Department, the Library of Congress, and the Draper, Anderson and Voorhis collections. As a popular biography and as a narrative of one of the most fascinating exploits in American history, the book has some merit; more than this it should not claim.

R. H. WOODY.

#### SEVENTH VOLUME OF SERIES

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT, 1850-1865. By Arthur Charles Cole. A History of American Life, Vol. VII. Edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger and Dixon Ryan Fox. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934. Pp. xv, 468. \$4.00.

This volume, seventh of a series on the social history of the United States by a group of distinguished historians, is of more than passing interest. Covering a relatively brief chronological period and dealing with the multiplicity of factors which made the pattern of the social and economic order of the fifties, the author reveals both a sound knowledge and a clear style. To describe the life of America from the Compromise of 1850 to Appomattox with scarcely a mention of politics, and that, too, in a period when political excitement seemed to sweep everything before it, is no mean task for the historian. But this task Professor Cole performs with a full measure of success, although the topical treatment necessarily employed makes for an apparent lack of unity. At first glance the very title of the book, *The Irrepressible Conflict*, carries almost purely a political connotation, but it is soon apparent that the social and economic distinctions existing between the North and the South, the desire for Southern independence and Northern domination, are fundamental to any understanding of the political controversy. Perfectly justifiable, we think, is the author's discussion of the Know Nothing party in the chapter, "Immigration. Becomes a National Problem," for, in fact, this party was primarily the result of a social movement. In this connection, however, we wish that an explanation of the political affiliations of particular foreign groups had been advanced.

Scarcely any phase of life is left untouched. The social and eco-

conomic aspects of slavery, North and South, agriculture, immigration, crime, poverty, labor, health, education, literature, art, music, the churches (especially as they were affected by the slavery controversy), and the non-military and non-political aspects of the Civil War. Four chapters cover the war period. The development of the West is properly emphasized. What is said in regard to the South has to do mainly with the social classes, slavery, and land. The Editors' Foreword advances the opinion that the aristocratic South was "indifferent to intellectual achievement and hostile to freedom of opinion." The author finds that during the educational and cultural advances of the North the South "remained unaffected by the new currents of civilization. It did not share in the movement for popular education; it took a negligible part in the lyceum movement; it supported few magazines or publishing houses; it had little of a creative nature to contribute to science, scholarship, letters and arts."

Professor Cole has used a wide variety of sources, especially the writings of contemporaries, newspapers, and the observations of foreign visitors, and has gleaned many little-known bits of information. We learn, for example, that German immigrants brought the "trained prescription druggist" as well as lager beer, that hogs were used as scavengers, and that "never before or since have whiskers had such a vogue in America." The book has numerous illustrations, it is remarkably free from typographical errors, and we noticed only one misspelled name.

R. H. WOODY.

#### THE ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLES LAMB

AT THE SHRINE OF ST. CHARLES: STRAY PAPERS ON LAMB BROUGHT TOGETHER FOR THE CENTENARY OF HIS DEATH IN 1834. By E. V. Lucas. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1934. Pp. 141.

CHARLES LAMB: *A Study*. By J. Lewis May. London: Geoffrey Bless, 1934. Pp. 235.

CHARLES LAMB: *His Life Recorded by His Contemporaries*. By Edmund Blunden. London: Hogarth Press, 1934. Pp. 256. 7s. 6d.

THE FROLIC AND THE GENTLE: *A Centenary Study of Charles Lamb*. By A. C. Ward. London: Methuen and Co., 1934. Pp. 230. 6s.

CHARLES LAMB. By Orlo Williams. Great Lives. London: Duckworth, 1934. Pp. 144. 2s.

The crop of books brought forth by the centenary of Charles Lamb's death suffered a notable loss in the last-minute postponement

of Mr. Lucas's definitive edition of Lamb's letters to 1935. It remains, however, a not unworthy, though not a specially distinguished tribute to its subject.

Mr. Lucas's papers range from stray notes of a page or two on such slight subjects as Hell-Fire Dick (a coachman with whom Lamb took a short journey) to such interesting and suggestive essays as "The Evolution of Whimsicality," in which he traces the "unreluctant egotism" and humor that constitute the originality of Elia not only to Lamb's own letters but also to the "divine chit-chat" (Lamb's phrase) of Cowper's letters. Several of the papers add small biographical details, such as "Lamb and the Measles"—not his own—and the journey of the Lambs to Paris—which might have been somewhat amplified had Mr. Lucas known Mary Shelley's letter on the subject. Even possible or wished-for details are included. Thus we owe his interesting record of a set of scales where Londoners recorded their weights from 1765 till after Lamb's death to the fact that a Charles Lamb has his weight recorded there. His weight is excessive for the spare Elia, and Mr. Lucas himself is doubtful, but after all it *might* be his hero. Similarly, the absence of Lamb's letters to Martin Burney prompts Mr. Lucas to supply the defect himself, which he does in a most convincing style, so that his postscript, announcing the discovery of a real letter to Martin Burney, is almost a disappointment. If anyone is sufficiently impervious to Mr. Lucas's pleasing style to object that some of his matter is a bit trivial, he need only consider the words "shrine" and "Saint Charles" in the title and reflect that by common consent the author is high priest.

Mr. May, by contrast, is the upstanding layman, but equally firm in the faith. He protests that he is not writing another life or centenary tribute; he is writing a book about Charles Lamb because he likes to. Making copious and slightly unconventional use of his own knowledge and miscellaneous reading he emancipates himself from most previous writing on the subject except Mr. Lucas's biography and evolves Charles Lamb from the letters and essays. His individual method finds its most extreme expression in a thirteen-page chapter on Lamb at Christ's Hospital. Approximately the first eight pages are given to some sensible remarks, liberally buttressed by Matthew Arnold and Anatole France, on the value of an education based on the classics. A short paragraph then introduces Lamb into the school, after which a discussion of "the real value of our public school system" quotes rather largely from Lamb's essay. The scanty three pages on Lamb at

school are mostly by Lamb himself. Yet the reader emerges really impressed with Mr. May's thesis that Christ's Hospital, with its Latin curriculum (never fully described) is largely responsible for the sense of imponderable values that led Charles to go counter to his brother James's more practical commonsense in the great decisions of his life. He will make the purely personal allowance when, unlike Mr. May, he begins wondering about all the other Christ's Hospital boys. But Mr. May's devotion is not blind. He thinks little of Lamb's newspaper work, praises Mary above Charles in their collaboration on Shakespeare, shows a most uncanonical charity for Charles's level-headed, selfish brother, and even says that Charles was disgracefully drunk at Haydon's the evening Wordsworth was visited there by his brother exciseman. Over the *Essays of Elia* he is, of course, contagiously enthusiastic. He comes nearest to tasteless eulogy when he gives a brief catalogue of the immortals who pace gravely forth to welcome Elia into Elysium, headed by "Homer and Virgil, Shakespeare and Milton," et al.

Edmund Blunden expressed his principal views of Lamb in his Clark Lectures at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1932. In the present volume he merely rounds out his critical contribution with some additional factual details. To the materials already brought together and interpreted by Mr. Lucas in his biography he adds letters made available by the new edition of Coleridge's letters and a new account of the famous Wednesday evenings of the Lambs as described by the poet John Clare.

Mr. Ward in his biographical treatment offers a useful and intelligent condensation of Lucas, but, like many others, finds it difficult to go further. His analytical comment on the writings of Lamb has more independent value, particularly his treatment of the too much neglected non-Elia works that were once thought important enough—before Elia appeared—to justify the publication of Lamb's works.

Perhaps the hardest task of all is creditably accomplished in Mr. Williams's unpretentious little volume. For not only does he make good use of previous scholarship—and his own—in a short general presentation of the man and his works, but he offers observations of value to the more experienced Elia in his account of Lamb's smoking and drinking, the domestic life of Charles and Mary, and the character of Mary.

In these times of over-emphasized anniversaries not every author fares so well at the hands of his admirers as Lamb has done.

NEWMAN I. WHITE.



## STEELE

SIR RICHARD STEELE. By Willard Connely. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934. Pp. vi, 462. \$3.75.

This is an attempt to reduce to the compass of a single volume the information in Aitken's biography with many items turned up since he wrote, and to present the material in a readable form. The author performs the task with a measure of success. Perhaps the very nature of his undertaking involved him in a style which does not leave the impression he wished, because it reveals too nakedly his studied pains to produce the effect desired. Nevertheless, the result is the best one volume on Steele as a writer that has thus far appeared. A layman or undergraduate interested in the man may like the book.

But Steele was noteworthy as a political figure; his literary reputation was achieved in part by his public connections. The historian will be vexed more often than he is enlightened as he reads. At times Mr. Connely is unpardonably careless with facts. The literary trick of making an occasion vivid by using specific details is effective only when the details are accurate, if the reader is acquainted with the facts. To say (p. 277) that "At twilight on September 18 George I landed at Greenwich and proceeded straight to Whitehall" is impressive, unless one recalls that such was not the procedure of the King. Instead, he held a levee of assembled courtiers at Greenwich the following day and went to London the second day with a formidable procession of his new subjects arranged after awkward delay. The sarcasm about Steele's congratulation on Swift's "deanery" (p. 231) is wasted without evidence that the latter "longed for a bishopric." The account of the break between Swift and Steele would be more convincing (pp. 229 ff.) if it made clear which of the letters quoted were private and which published at the time. The charge (p. 143) that Defoe "turned either Whig or Tory with no more conscience than a weathercock" needs proof or amplification before it ought to be taken as a fact. The statement (p. 376) that Steele "blocked the peerage bill" is interesting if true. That Bolingbroke urged Anne to favor her brother before she died (p. 255) may possibly be so, but the weight of evidence is on the other side. Mr. Connely's interpretation of Harley's politics was abandoned by good historians long ago. To say (p. 167) that before 1710 the Queen had dismissed him "as lazy, shifty, lying, drunken, and ill-mannered" is to betray a carelessness in dating charges made, almost too amazing to credit in one who labored so long over the sentences in this book. Footnotes at the end with no indication except an arrange-



ment according to chapters to identify the passages referred to, would leave a better impression but for these and other cases of his failure either to make careful notes or to use carefully those made.

W. T. LAPRADE.

#### THE LIFE OF A QUEEN

ANNE OF ENGLAND, THE BIOGRAPHY OF A GREAT QUEEN. By M. R. Hopkinson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. Pp. xvi, 385. \$3.50.

Mrs. Hopkinson is an ardent admirer of the queen of whom she writes. Indeed, the enthusiasm reflected in her title indicates a danger of weakening her case by emphasizing it too much. Soberer historians have pointed out before that Anne was not the pliant clay in other hands familiar in the older books. However, the present pedestrian account is chiefly based on these books and on Professor Trevelyan's work. Notably absent from the bibliography and notes are references to the books of Professors Morgan and Feiling, who have both contributed to making some of the author's points. Most strangely missing is any reference to the printed papers of Robert Harley, the minister and intimate confidant of the Queen. The narrative begins with a prologue acclaiming the "true story of Anne . . . as fantastic as a fairy tale" and proceeds from the career of her grandfather, Edward Hyde, through the secret marriage of her mother and her own life lived wholly in a stirring time, to final "Peace at Last" and an appendix on the excessive number of children she is sometimes said to have borne to tragic fates. A reader wishing a sympathetic life of Anne may not be able to find another as good. With thus much merit, it is a pity it is not better still.

W. T. LAPRADE.

#### HISTORICAL RESEARCH

AIDS TO HISTORICAL RESEARCH. By John Martin Vincent. New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934. Pp. vii, 173. \$2.25.

This little volume is intended to help a student beginning to study history on his own account. It deals with such subjects as Testing of Materials; Diplomatics; Paleography; Chronology; the Seal; Heraldry; Weights, Measures, and Money; Genealogy; Diplomacy; Geography; and Historical Evidence. It is more elementary than the same author's previous volume, *Historical Research: An Outline of Theory and Practice*, which appeared in 1911, but seems substantial enough to make beginners aware of the diversity of problems they have to solve in searching the records of the past for facts.

W. T. LAPRADE.

## EAST AND WEST

THE IDEALS OF EAST AND WEST. By Kenneth J. Saunders. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. Pp. 246. \$2.50.

In this book Professor Saunders analyzes the chief ethical systems of the East, derived from India and China, and those of the West, derived from the Greeks and Hebrews. The six chapters discuss the ethics of India, the Chinese, the Japanese, the Greeks, the Hebrews, and Christian ethics. The book will be very useful for students and teacher in classes in comparative ethics. The somewhat fanciful prologue and epilogue do not make any particular addition to the strength of the work. Many readers and students outside of schools will find this book a useful, reliable, and attractive summary of the different ethical systems described.

JAMES CANNON, III.

## TWO NEW MISSION BOOKS

THE CHRISTIAN MISSION AND THE MODERN WORLD. By W. D. Schermerhorn. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1934. Pp. 350. \$2.50.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND A NEW WORLD CULTURE. By Archibald G. Baker. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1934. Pp. 322. \$2.00.

Professor Schermerhorn has published a most acceptable text for seminary use on the present status of Christian mission work. Just this type of text has long been needed. A specific value of the book is that the picture of Christian missions in each area is given against a background of the country and the people occupying that area. A very large amount of material is contained in the book, and yet while compact, it is readable, scholarly, and interesting. There are a number of outline maps, and a good bibliography.

Professor Baker undertakes not so much a description of the status of Christian missions as a presentation of Christianity as a cultural factor. This presentation is made with a good deal of ability. There will possibly be a difference of opinion among the supporters of evangelistic mission work as to the author's conclusion, which is contained in Part IV, "Toward a Philosophy of Missions." Probably a larger number will not at this time, or for some time to come, be prepared to accept all of Professor Baker's findings.

JAMES CANNON, III.

## THE TWELVE LIVING RELIGIONS

FAITHS MEN LIVE BY. By John Clark Archer. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1934. Pp. 497. \$3.00.

This book is primarily a textbook for senior college and seminary classes studying the history of religions. It is the most satisfactory of the recent books in this field. Within the nearly five hundred pages the author has crammed the chief facts about the twelve living religions. For the purpose of this reviewer, chapters one and two make the book especially helpful, as many of the books on the living religions do not give, as does this author, any discussion of primitive religion. In chapter one there is a discussion of religion in general and a collection of definitions of religion. An additional section on the origin of religion would improve it still more. Somewhat strangely, the chapter on the Moslem religion seems least satisfactory. A page or two giving an outline of the historical explanation of Islam would be valuable.

The book is the only thing in English comparable to Dr. George F. Moore's *History of Religions*. It does not give any account of the religions of the ancient world, but does make a contemporary approach to each faith discussed. The book is not simply a classroom text, but will be helpful to any general students of religion. The final chapter, comparing religions, might well have been expanded, had space permitted. The book includes a student's manual and a bibliography.

JAMES CANNON, III.

## NATIONALISM IN LOMBARDY

ECONOMICS AND LIBERALISM IN THE RISORGIMENTO: *A Study of Nationalism in Lombardy, 1814-1848*. By Kent Roberts Greenfield. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. 365. \$3.00.

From the manifold and perplexing problems occasioned by the exaggerated nationalism of contemporary Europe it is a relief to turn to the historic origins of this most powerful of political forces when high hopes were cherished of the good it would accomplish. Historians have recently been probing deeply into its causes. One group of scholars has centered its attention upon the well-known literary, philosophical, or political leaders by whom nationalist ideology and methods were presumably determined or upon such pressure groups as the Pan-Slavs and the Pan-Germans. Until the last few years, this approach was characteristic of the study of the movement for Italian unity. The status of Mazzini as the prophet, the inspirational leader of Italian

nationalism, of Garibaldi as its knight-errant, and of Cavour as its practical statesman and diplomat, remained essentially intact. The works of Ciasca, Prato, Agnelli, and other Italian scholars first made possible a broader understanding of the economic, social, and political background of these outstanding leaders. Professor Greenfield's book at once takes an important place among these pioneer studies. It is a significant contribution not only to Italian history but also to a more realistic understanding of the rise of nationalism.

The scene is Lombardy, "the richest and most 'progressive' of the Italian communities," and the period that of Austrian rule and of the Risorgimento. A detailed survey of the agricultural, commercial, and industrial conditions serves as a foundation, for, as the author justly observes, "to understand what that community thought, it seemed to me important to know how it lived." For the thought of that community, he turned with interesting results to the Lombard periodicals. In Gianomenico Romagnosi, who became at sixty-six the editor of the *Annali universali* and the leader of a group of devoted young disciples in an "open conspiracy" for Italy's emancipation, he discovered a neglected "maker" of Italy whose contribution to the development of an Italian national consciousness, in his opinion, was at least equal to that of Mazzini. Of course, the Austrian censorship made direct propaganda for political unity impossible, but Romagnosi and his followers nevertheless carried on an effective literary campaign for that very purpose under the eyes of Austrian officials who were too stupid to understand its real objective. By advocating in and out of season a general effort to place Italy in the main stream of western civilization, especially by the establishment of railroads, steamship lines, a custom union on the model of the German *Zollverein*, a uniform system of weights and measures, and a national copyright law, they encouraged a national consciousness in regard to these practical matters. Appeals for coöperative charitable and educational enterprises stimulated a sense of civic responsibility. These publicists carefully avoided anything like Mazzini's program of direct revolutionary action, not so much as a result of the Austrian censorship as because it was alien to their liberal principles. They were confident that the progress of civilization, if its fruits were assured to Italy, would eventually and automatically level the barriers to the attainment of her aspirations. The author is manifestly not unsympathetic to Romagnosi's somewhat exaggerated claim: "I myself hold in my hands the threads of Italian unity."

In his legitimate enthusiasm for this group of moderate liberals and

its leader, for whose recognition he is largely responsible, Professor Greenfield is less than fair in his estimate of the work of Mazzini's group. The latter, he writes, were "only . . . tugging at their own bootstraps" in their advocacy of direct revolutionary action. This view may be close to the truth, but it needs the support of as close a study of Mazzini's influence as he has devoted to the more obscure Lombard journalists. No serious effort, in fact, has been made to evaluate the effect in Lombardy of Mazzini's subterranean propaganda. The author's methods and documentation are, in general, above reproach. A more definite analysis and explanation of the censorship would, however, have been useful. The absence of any reference to daily newspapers is also regrettable, for readers may conclude that the Lombard press was limited to the periodical reviews from which the material for this study was largely drawn.

E. MALCOLM CARROLL.

